STATE OF TENNESSEE

Office of the Attorney General



ROBERT E. COOPER, JR. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND REPORTER

ANDY D. BENNETT
CHIEF DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

LUCY HONEY HAYNES
ASSOCIATE CHIEF DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL

MAILING ADDRESS

P.O. BOX 20207 NASHVILLE, TN 37202 MICHAEL E. MOORE SOLICITOR GENERAL

CORDELL HULL BUILDING

TELEPHONE (615) 741-3491 FACSIMILE (615) 741-2009

April 24, 2007

Chairman Sara Kyle c/o Sharla Dillon Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505

filed electronically in docket office on 04/24/07

Re: Tennessee American Water Company Rate Case TRA Docket No. 06-00290

Dear Chairman Kyle:

Enclosed please find Terry Buckner's Supplemental Responses to No. 3 of the Company's discovery requests to the Consumer Advocate Division.

Very truly yours,

Steve Butler

Assistant Attorney General

(615) 741-8722

cc: Mr. R. Dale Grimes

Mr. J. Richard Collier

Mr. Henry W. Walker

Mr. Michael A. McMahan

Mr. David G. Higney

Mr. Fredrick L. Hitchcock

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL - STATE OF TENNESSEE CONSUMER ADVOCATE AND PROTECTION DIVISION ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT FEES TENNESSEE AMERICAN WATER COMPANY - TRA DOCKET #06-00290

		COMPANY	COMPANY	
		FORECAST	FORECAST	
		TRA DOCKET	TRA DOCKET	PERCENT
LINE#	CATEGORY	#04-00288	#06-00290	GROWTH
1	Labor	\$ 4,383,883	\$ 4,702,966	7.28%
2	Group Insurance	1,386,004	1,513,667	9.21%
3	Pensions	892,790	595,798	-33.27%
4	Management Fees	3,062,940	4,064,421	32.70%
5	Total	\$ 9,725,617 A /	\$ 10,876,852 D/	11.84%
		CAPD	COMPANY	
		FORECAST	FORECAST	
		TRA DOCKET	TRA DOCKET	PERCENT
		<u>#04-00288</u>	<u>#06-00290</u>	<u>GROWTH</u>
6	Labor	\$ 4,082,080	\$ 4,702,966	15.21%
7	Group Insurance	1,339,248	1,513,667	13.02%
8	Pensions	829,731	595,798	-28.19%
9	Management Fees	3,219,932	4,064,421	26.23%
10	Total	\$ 9,470,991 B /	\$ 10,876,852 D/	14.84%
			COMPANY	
			FORECAST	
			TRA DOCKET	PERCENT
		ACTUAL	#06-00290	GROWTH
11	Labor	\$ 3,765,383	\$ 4,702,966	24.90%
12	Group Insurance	1,563,967	1,513,667	-3.22%
13	Pensions	318,289	595,798	87.19%
14	Management Fees	3,752,617	4,064,421	8.31%
15	Total	\$ 9,400,256 C /	\$ 10,876,852 D /	15.71%

A/ CAPD Work Paper E-REC-1, Lines 1, 6, 7, and 8.

B/ Settlement Agreement, Exhibit CAPD-RTB, Schedule 5, Lines 1, 6, 7, and 8.

C/ Company Rebuttal Exhibit MAM-15, Page 2 of 2.

D/ Company Exhibit, No. 2, Schedule 3, Page 1 of 1, Lines 1, 11, 13, and 15.

CONSUMER ADVOCATE AND PROTECTION DIVISION ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT FEES OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL - STATE OF TENNESSEE

PAGE 1 OF 2

TENNESSEE AMERICAN WATER COMPANY - TRA DOCKET #06-00290

5	4	ω	2	_	LINE #			
Total	Management Fees	Pensions	Group Insurance	Labor	CATEGORY		A/ TN American	
69				63			굮	
9,425,851	2,507,276	387,985	1,463,924	5,066,666	3/31/2004	#03-00118	TRA DOCKET	(1)
\$9,632,011	2,535,587	141,820	1,725,805	\$5,228,799	2004			(2)
\$10,408,753	2,607,538	344,846	2,060,248	\$ 5,396,121	2005			(3)
9,425,851 \$9,632,011 \$10,408,753 \$11,643,564 \$10,912,896 \$ 10,876,852	3,010,950	1,151,099	1,912,718	\$ 5,568,797	2006			(4)
\$10,912,896	2,771,251	665,606	1,729,041	\$ 5,746,998	2007			(5)
\$ 10,876,852	4,064,421	595,798	1,513,667	\$ 4,702,966	#06-00290	TRA DOCKET		(6)
\$ 10,876,852					VARIANCE	FEES	MANAGEMENT	(7)
\$ 10,876,852					VARIANCE	TOTAL		(8)

13 14 15 16 17	11 12	10	9876
Net Variance (Line 5 minus Line 12) CAPD/Company Management Fee Forecast Difference CAPD/Company Labor Forecast Difference Group Insurance Forecast Difference Pension Expense Forecast Difference Total of Lines 13-17	Capitalization Rate Change Net Total	Total	CAPD Labor Group Insurance Pensions Management Fees
Ö	B/	\$ 9,725,617	TRA DOCKET #04-00288 12/31/2005 \$ 4,383,883 1,386,004 892,790 3,062,940
	Q	\$10,468,674	2006 \$ 4,524,167 1,597,632 1,169,074 3,177,800
	C/	\$10,086,120	2006 2007 #06-00290 \$ 4,524,167 \$ 4,668,941 \$ 4,397,377 1,597,632 1,444,250 1,386,168 1,169,074 675,962 12,662 3,177,800 3,296,968 3,021,111
# Q F	D/ E/ \$	\$ 9,725,617 \$10,468,674 \$10,086,120 \$ 8,817,318 \$ 10,	TRA DOCKET #06-00290 \$ 4,397,377 1,386,168 12,662 3,021,111
1,036,524 1,043,310	(245,793) 9,840,328	10,086,120	
↔ ↔		↔	
2,059,534 (1,043,310) (305,589) (127,499) (583,136)		,086,120 \$ 8,817,318	

A/ Company Rebuttal Exhibit MAM-15, reconciled for \$7,000 error in Group Insurance to Company Forecast Amount in Docket #06-00290.

B/ CAPD Work Paper, E-REC-1, P1, Column 1, Lines 1, 6, 7, and 8 per Company Exhibit No. 2, Schedule 3, Lines 1, 11, 13, and 15.

C/ Column 3 Labor amount grown at 3.2% per year per Company Rebuttal Exhibit MAM-15

Group Insurance Cost per employee per Company Rebuttal Exhibit MAM-15, Page 2 of 2, times 106 employees Pension Expense per employee per Company Rebuttal Exhibit MAM-15, Page 2 of 2, times 106 employees Management Fees grown at 3.75% per year.

D/ CAPD Work Paper E-REC-1, P1, Column 10, Lines 1, 6, 7, and 8.

E/ Capitalization Rate of 16.61% in Docket #04-00288 and 21% in Docket #06-00290 per CAPD Work Paper E-REC-1, P1, Column 11, Line 6.

G/ CAPD Work Paper E-REC-1, P1, Column 11, Line 1.

H/ CAPD Work Paper E-REC-1, P1, Column 11, Line 7.

H/ CAPD Work Paper E-REC-1, P1, Column 11, Line 8.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL - STATE OF TENNESSEE CONSUMER ADVOCATE AND PROTECTION DIVISION ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT FEES TENNESSEE AMERICAN WATER COMPANY - TRA DOCKET #06-00290

PAGE 2 OF 2

15	112	10	9876		5	4 3 2 1
Total	CAPD FORECASTS Labor Group Insurance Pensions Management Fees	Total	COMPANY FORECASTS Labor Group Insurance Pensions Management Fees	A/ B/ Growth Rate of Company Forecast from 2005 actual	Total	ACTUAL Labor Group Insurance Pensions Management Fees
\$ 9,425,851 B /	TRA DOCKET #03-00118 3/31/2004 \$ 5,066,666 1,463,924 387,985 2,507,276	\$ 9,425,851 C/	TRA DOCKET #03-00118 3/31/2004 \$ 5,066,666 1,463,924 387,985 2,507,276	A/ pany Forecast from	\$ 8,986,086	(1) TRA DOCKET #03-00118 3/31/2004 \$ 4,631,351 1,345,749 516,005 2,492,981
				B / 2005 actual	\$ 9,722,650	(2) <u>2004</u> \$ 4,212,010 1,362,217 136,107 4,012,316
\$ 9,470,991 E /	TRA DOCKET #04-00288 12/31/2005 \$ 4,082,080 1,339,248 829,731 3,219,932	\$ 9,725,617 D/	TRA DOCKET #04-00288 12/31/2005 \$ 4,383,883 1,386,004 892,790 3,062,940	В/	\$ 9,400,256	(3) 2005 \$ 3,765,383 1,563,967 318,289 3,752,617
				B/	\$ 11,240,089	(4) <u>2006</u> \$ 4,256,528 1,542,409 1,128,624 4,312,528
\$ 8,817,318 F/	TRA DOCKET #06-00290 2/29/08 \$ 4,397,377 1,386,168 12,662 3,021,111	\$ 10,876,852 B/	TRA DOCKET #06-00290 2/29/08 \$ 4,702,966 1,513,667 595,798 4,064,421	B/ 15.71%	\$ 10,876,852	(5) COMPANY FORECAST TRA DOCKET #06-00290 \$ 4,702,966 1,513,667 595,798 4,064,421

A/ Company Exhibit No. 2, Schedule 3, Lines 1, 11, 13, and 15.

B/ Company Rebuttal Exhibit MAM-15, Page 2 of 2.

C/ Company Rebuttal Exhibit MAM-15, Page 1 of 2.

D/ CAPD Work Paper, E-REC-1, P1, Column 1, Lines 1, 6, 7, and 8.

E/ Per TRA Docket #04-00288 Settlement Agreement, Schedule 5, Lines 1, 6, 7, and 8.

F/ CAPD Work Paper, E-REC-1, P1, Column 11, Lines 1, 6, 7, and 8.

Public Utility Accounting: Theory and Application

by

James E. Suelflow

1973

MSU Public Utilities Studies

Institute of Public Utilities' Division of Research Graduate School of Business Administration Michigan State University

ciate them on an item-by-item basis. It is doubtful that such reasoning is as valid today, since methods and tools are available which allow the utility to do this. Electronic data processing equipment can perform the necessary calculations required for unit depreciation with very little effort. The question that must be asked, however, is how much more accurate is unit depreciation versus a group method. The point should be clear: If accuracy is not sacrificed under a group method and may, in fact, be greater than under a single unit method, the use of group depreciation is not only proper and expedient, but also almost a requirement. Whether or not group depreciation is used is certainly a management decision. The utility manager, however, must be aware of the shortcomings as well as the advantages of the method to ensure that within the legal confines and uniform accounting systems prescribed no more or less than the cost of the assets should be reflected through depreciation accounting.

Accounting for Depreciation

The procedure of accounting for depreciation involves a systematic converting of unexpired asset costs into periodic expenses. Expressed another way, it is the appropriate matching of revenues with expenses—depreciation expense representing the extinguishing of an asset's useful life to produce revenues for the particular accounting period. Accounting for depreciation expense recognizes that: (1) the cost of the asset less salvage value is the amount to be systematically allocated as depreciation; (2) no more nor no less than the cost of the asset is depreciable; and (3) by considering this cost only depreciation will keep the initial investment of nominal dollars intact. The asset remains on the utility's accounting records until it is either retired or replaced, and only then are the accounting records relieved of a particular item.

The journal entries involved in the life of an asset are presented below.

- (1) To record the asset placed into utility service:
 - Dr. Electric Plant in Service
 - Cr. Accounts Payable, Cash, Construction Work in Process, or Materials and Supplies

ACCOUNTING FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES

ROBERT L. HAHNE

GREGORY E. ALIFF

DELOITTE & TOUCHE LLP

Contributing Authors: The following were the original contributing authors of Accounting for Public Utilities. While much of what these individuals originally wrote has been removed or replaced through the annual update process, we wish to continue to recognize their contributions in the creation of this book.

FRANCIS J. ANDREWS, JR.

WILLIAM W. EYERS

JOHN S. FERGUSON

HERNAN GONZALEZ

JOHN D. MCCLELLAN

RICHARD W. MCCULLOUGH

JAMES E. MORRIS

RANDALL A. SNOWLING

JAN A. UMBAUGH

2003

Filed Through:

RELEASE NO. 20, OCTOBER 2003



to produce revenues adequate to cover operating expenses plus depreciation, taxes, and capital costs.

This measure is used primarily in rate proceedings of transportation companies and, in some instances, in establishing water or wastewater company rate levels. It has been used as a substitute for the rate base/rate of return approach in situations in which investor-provided capital and the related capital costs have not been a significant factor in the total cost of providing services.

[2] Considerations Affecting the Ratemaking Approach

The particular ratemaking approach used must fit into a framework of conceptual, practical, and legal considerations.

[a] Conceptual

Conceptually, any of these approaches may be acceptable in the determination of revenue requirements for a regulated utility. The utility incurs costs in providing customer services and is entitled to a reasonable opportunity to recover those costs (presumably incurred at reasonable levels for prudent purposes). Accordingly, the ratemaking process, by whatever means employed, should result in producing rates that, when applied to sales or to services rendered, generate revenues equal to the cost of service incurred. This is fundamental to traditional ratemaking philosophies and procedures, and the structuring of the cost components in a particular format (i.e., the style of ratemaking) should facilitate this objective.

[b] Practical

Practical considerations typically have more effect on the rate-making style or format than conceptual considerations. Most often, the physical, economic, and financial characteristics of the regulated entity dictate the approach used. Capital intensive companies, such as electric, gas, and telephone utilities, require large fixed investments in plant facilities and are generally financed with substantial amounts of debt and equity capital. In these instances, the rate base has a significant role in measuring service costs. Concurrently, the capital markets provide a ready source of data for assessing the costs of debt and equity capital supporting the rate base. These conditions

(Matthew Bender & Co., Inc.)

(Rei.10-11/93 Pub.016)

are ideally suited for application of the rate base/rate or return measure.

Some regulated companies do not have the attributes that are suited for rate base/rate of return applications. Transportation companies, for example, generally are not capital intensive because so many of them lease a large portion of the operating facilities. As a result, operating costs dominate the cost of service, and capital investment (and the related capital cost requirements) are much less significant. In these situations, an alternative measure, such as the operating ratio approach, is more useful in establishing revenue levels required to offset the costs of service.

Other examples of companies not having the attributes that are conducive to rate base/rate of return measurements are found in the water/wastewater industry. Although water/wastewater companies are capital intensive, many situations exist in which customers provide substantial portions of the capital funds in the form of contributions in aid of construction. These customer-provided funds are normally deducted from the rate base and often result in nominal (or even negative) rate base amounts. If the capital that *investors* supply is relatively insignificant or even nonexistent, that capital does not provide an adequate foundation for using the rate base/rate of return measure of service costs, and an alternative measure, such as the operating ratio, is applied.

In addition, a utility may be involved in nonregulated or non jurisdictional operations or in a variety of classes or types of service. These conditions require practical considerations in choosing the ratemaking approach to cost measurement. An example may be given as follows:

Company A

- —Electric services only.
- —One regulatory jurisdiction.
- —One class of service under one general rate schedule.
- No nonutility investments or operations.

Company B

- -Electric and gas service.
- —Regulated by several states for retail sales and by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for wholesale sales.
- —Multiple classes of service and multiple rate schedules (e.g., residential, commercial, industrial, special, etc.).
- —Investments in nonregulated operations.

The differences between the above companies could result in differing approaches because an approach that functions well in Company A may be somewhat cumbersome in Company B.

[c] Legal

Legal provisions under controlling regulatory statutes may also limit the mechanics that may be used to develop revenue requirements. Statutory language may differ considerably between rate jurisdictions. In some instances, the regulator has wide discretion as to the measure used, while in others, the statutes may specify the approach in some detail. Illustrations are as follows:

State A

The commission is responsible for fixing just and reasonable rates at a level that will provide the utility with a reasonable opportunity to recover all costs prudently incurred in providing utility service.

State B

The commission is responsible for fixing just and reasonable rates at a level that will provide the utility with a reasonable opportunity to recover prudently incurred:

- (1) operating costs;
- (2) depreciation;

(Matthew Bender & Co., Inc.)

(Rel.10-11/93 Pub.016)

- 1. O. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
 - A. My name is Roy L. Ferrell and my address is 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Charleston, WV 25302.
- 2. Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
 - A. I am employed by American Water Works Service Company, Inc. ("Service Company"), as Director of Rates and Planning for the Service Company's Southeast Region (the "Southeast Region"). My primary responsibilities are to supervise the preparation and filing of rate cases, annual business plans, and five-year strategic business plans for American affiliates assigned to the Southeast Region, consisting of; Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland and Kentucky.
- 3. Q. WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND BUSINESS EXPERIENCE?
 - A. Yes. In September 1968, I joined the Service Company as a junior accountant for what was then known as the Southern Division. From January 1971 to November 1973, I was assigned as a rate accountant and assisted in the preparation of rate cases for both West Virginia Water Company and Huntington Water Corporation in West Virginia. In December 1973, I received a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from the

wage rates through the attrition year. The wage rates for each pay class in effect for the attrition year were pro-rated based upon the number of days in the attrition year. The result is an average attrition year wage rate for each union employee.

For non-union hourly and clerical employees, current wage rates that became effective on April 1, 2002 were adjusted for wage increases of 3% on April 1, 2003. As was done for union wage rates, the test year wage rate was calculated based upon the number of days each of those wages were in effect.

21. Q. HOW WERE THE ATTRITION YEAR WAGE LEVELS FOR SALARIED EMPLOYEES DETERMINED?

A. Salaried employees are exempt from overtime pay. For that reason, the current annual salary for each employee has been adjusted for expected wage increases of 3% on April 1, 2003. Consistent with the other employee classes, the 2003 salaries were calculated based upon the number of days each of the salary amounts would be in effect.

PENSION ADJUSTMENT

- 22. Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COMPANY'S PENSION ADJUSTMENT IN THIS CASE.
 - A. The Company participates with all its American Water Services ("AWS") affiliates in a system-wide Pension Plan. Its actuary, Towers Perrin, prepares the AWS's pension calculations. The Company's adjustment to pension expense is based on Towers

Perrin's Actuarial Report for 2002-2003.

- 23. Q. HAVE THE COMPANY'S CIRCUMSTANCES REGARDING PENSION EXPENSE CHANGED SINCE 1996?
 - A. Yes. In 1996, the Company was advised that the mutual insurance company that held most of the AWS pension assets was converted to a stock company, and the stock was distributed as a one-time dividend to the respective policyholders. AWS's pension fund, as one of the largest policyholders, received a one-time \$47,000,000 gain from the sale of this stock. This gain caused the Plan to become fully funded; that is, the Plan reached the "full funding limit" under ERISA when the Plan's assets on July 1, 1996, exceeded actuarial accrued liability plus normal cost. As a result, no ERISA contribution had been required until the test year in this case.

OTHER POSTRETIREMENT EMPLOYEE BENEFITS ("OPEBs"):

- 24. Q. MR. FERRELL, WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC AREAS OF OPEBs THAT YOU WILL BE ADDRESSING?
 - A. I will address the Company's actual booking of OPEBs expensed and capitalized during the test year, twelve months ended July 31, 2002. I will also explain the Company's OPEB recovery sought in this case.
- 25. Q. WHAT OPEBS COST IS REFLECTED ON THE COMPANY'S BOOKS FOR THE TEST YEAR?

Commission recommended a disallowance of eight vacant positions.⁷ Consequently, there appears to be a pattern of petitioning for funding by the American Water Companies for vacant positions in their cost of service. Further, in TAWC's last rate proceeding, an employee level of 119⁸ was included in TRA Order in Docket #03-00118 dated June 25, 2004. Yet, almost immediately after the TRA Order was approved, TAWC cut the number of employee positions from 123 at the end of June 2003 to 108 at the end of July 2003, a cut of 15 employee positions.⁹ This systematic bloating of employee levels by TAWC should not be allowed.

Therefore, it is the CAPD's contention that the forecast of Operation and Maintenance Labor should be based on a known and measurable employee level and not a speculative employee level.

TAWC has included \$105,157 in its forecast of Operations and Maintenance Labor for "incentive payroll." The incentive payroll is based on three performance goals: (1) Financial; (2) Operational; and

⁷Public Service Commission of West Virginia Case No. 03-0353-W-42T, Page 32.

⁸M. Miller direct testimony, Page 14, Lines 17-18.

⁹TAWC response to CAPD First Set of Discovery, Question 12.

¹⁰TAWC response to CAPD First Set of Discovery, Question 16.

Interrogatories and Requests for Production Of Documents by the Staff of the State Corporation Commission (First Set) To Tennessee-American Water Company Rate Case No. 04-00288

GENERAL:

9. Q. IF TAWC, ITS PARENT, MULTI-STATE UTILITY, OR AFFILIATED UTILITY SERVICE COMPANY, SEEKS TO RECOVER IN ITS RATES TO THE TENNESSEE RATEPAYERS ANY EMPLOYMENT SPEARATION PAYMENTS MADE UNDER ANY OF THE CONTRACTS, STATE THE AMOUNT OF ANY SPEARATION PAYMENTS SINCE THE LAST RATE FILING IN TENNESSEE.

Α.

Tennessee American Water Severed Employees						
Name	Severance Date	Amou	int of Severance			
Dwight Falls	8/3/2003	\$	29,946.40			
Pat Freeman	8/3/2003	\$	16,960.00			
Erleen Jones 🔾	8/3/2003	\$	25,100.80			
Nancy Head Olc	8/3/2003	\$	30,528.00			
Margaret Jacobs Ok	8/3/2003	\$	35,955.20			
Sandra Smith Ok	8/3/2003	\$	19,673.60			
Elizabeth Caudle	8/3/2003	\$	19,673.60			
Thomas Morrow Ok	8/3/2003	\$	40,206.00			
Dianna Holland	8/3/2003	\$	30,012.00			
Laurie Moore	8/3/2003	\$	18,300.00			
Frank Henderson 🤿 🛰	8/31/2003	\$	16,960.00			
Beverly Scheidt	9/28/2003	\$	13,400.00			
Marilyn Cotton	11/23/2003	\$	21,030.40			
Mike Loftin	6/6/2004	\$	6,820.00			
Shirley Frazier	8/15/2004	\$	47,479.64			
Dan Bailey	8/29/2004	\$	93,659.02			
Larry Stanley	8/29/2004	\$	46,079.05			
Donald Walker	8/29/2004	\$	45,379.72			
Joseph Harris	9/12/2004	\$	69,850.48			
Kim Durham	9/12/2004	\$	15,919.80			
Henry Janow	9/12/2004	\$	50,895.76			
Beth Ortega	9/26/2004	\$	14,697.20			
Total Severance		\$	708,526.67			
	•					

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

July 21, 2005

IN RE:)	
)	
PETITION OF TENNESSEE AMERICAN WATER)	DOCKET NO.
COMPANY TO CHANGE AND INCREASE CERTAIN)	04-00288
RATES AND CHARGES SO AS TO PERMIT IT)	
TO EARN A FAIR AND ADEQUATE RATE OF)	
RETURN ON ITS PROPERTY USED AND USEFUL IN)	
FURNISHING WATER SERVICE TO ITS CUSTOMERS)	

ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This matter came before Chairman Pat Miller, Director Deborah Taylor Tate and Director Sara Kyle of the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (the "Authority" or "TRA"), the voting panel assigned to this Docket, at a Hearing held on January 31, 2005 for consideration of the *Proposed Settlement Agreement* ("Settlement Agreement") between the Tennessee American Water Company ("TAWC" or "the Company"), the Consumer Advocate and Protection Division of the Office of the Attorney General of Tennessee ("Consumer Advocate"), the City of Chattanooga ("Chattanooga") and the Chattanooga Manufacturers Association ("CMA") (collectively "the parties").

BACKGROUND

On October 25, 1999, TAWC and Chattanooga entered into a settlement agreement of a previously-filed condemnation lawsuit wherein Chattanooga sought to acquire certain assets of TAWC. Section 2.B of the settlement agreement stated as follows:

¹ See City of Chattanooga v Tennessee-American Water Company et al., Case No. 99-C-1081, Circuit Court of Hamilton County, Division IV

[The Company] and the City will file a joint petition with the Tennessee Regulatory Authority ("TRA") seeking permission to reduce over a two-year period the current charge of \$301.00 a year per fire hydrant to \$50.00 a year per fire hydrant at the end of that period. If the TRA does not approve this provision, then this section is null and void.

In accordance with the settlement agreement, on November 17, 1999 TAWC filed a tariff for approval in TRA Docket No. 99-00891. TAWC proposed to decrease, in quarterly reductions, its annual charges to Chattanooga for fire hydrants from the rate of \$301.20 per hydrant to a reduced rate of \$50.00 per hydrant. According to TAWC, the reductions would result in an annual revenue impact of negative \$1,127,964.² During an Authority Conference held on January 11, 2000, a majority³ of the Directors voted to approve the proposed reduction in annual fire hydrant charges to Chattanooga. In its Order approving TAWC's tariff filing, the Authority recognized that the lost revenues would be imputed into TAWC's subsequent rate filings, thus reflecting the decision of the Company and its stockholders to absorb the contribution loss.⁴

On February 7, 2003, in Docket No. 03-00118, TAWC sought TRA approval of an increase in annual revenues of \$3,866,813 and an overall rate of return of 8.559% with an 11% return on equity during the attrition year ending March 31, 2004. In the proposed tariffs filed by TAWC, the additional annual revenues would be recovered by increased charges to all classes of customers. Chattanooga, the Consumer Advocate and CMA intervened in that docket and participated in the hearing held on June 30 and July 1, 2003. In advance of the hearing, TAWC and the Consumer Advocate filed with the Authority a Proposed Settlement Agreement relating to specific issues, including a return of 7.73%

² See In re Tariff Filing to Reduce Fire Hydrant Annual Charges as Part of a Settlement Agreement Between the City of Chattanooga and Tennessee-American Water Company, Docket No 99-00891, Company's Response to Authority Data Request, December 20, 1999, Attachment A

Director Lynn Greer voted not to approve the tariff

⁴ See In re Tariff Filing to Reduce Fire Hydrant Annual Charges as Part of a Settlement Agreement Between the City of Chattanooga and Tennessee-American Water Company, Docket No 99-00891, Order Approving Tariff, p 5 (September 26, 2000)

on investments and a 9.9% return on equity.

The panel voted unanimously to accept the Proposed Settlement Agreement⁵ and, by its acceptance, determined the rate base to be \$87,062,756, the return on investment to be 7.73% and the return on equity to be 9.9%. The two issues remaining for determination were the question of continued imputation of the reduction of fire hydrant charges and the appropriate rate design for implementing the rate increase. In Docket No. 99-00891, the TRA approved the tariff filing by TAWC that voluntarily reduced rates to Chattanooga by \$1,127,964 per year for public fire protection service. As part of its Petition in Docket No. 03-00118, TAWC requested the TRA reinstate this revenue stream. The parties in Docket No. 03-00118 were unable to reach a settlement on this issue. The panel found that while the record contained no evidence necessitating a modification of the Order in Docket No. 99-00891, there was evidence to support TAWC's claim that additional revenue requirement may be necessary. For these reasons, a majority of the panel found that the imputation of reduced fire hydrant rates to Chattanooga should be discontinued.⁶ The Authority concluded that TAWC was entitled to a rate increase of \$2,745,411. As to \$1,127,964 of the rate increase, the amount of \$563,982 was ordered to be recovered directly from Chattanooga through an increase to the fire hydrant rate.

Travel of this Docket

On September 10, 2004, TAWC filed a petition to change and increase certain rates and charges so as to permit it to earn a fair and adequate rate of return on its

⁵ *Id* at 44

⁶ See In re Petition of Tennessee American Water Company to Change and Increase Certain Rates and Charges so as to Permit It to Earn a Fair and Adequate Rate of Return on Its Property Used and Useful in Furnishing Water Service to Its Customers, Docket No 03-00118, Final Order Approving Rate Increase and Rate Design and Approving Rates Filed by Tennessee American Water Company and Concurrence and Dissent of Director Pat Miller (June 25, 2004)

property used and useful in furnishing water service to its customers ("Petition") The pre-filed direct testimonies of Mr. Paul T. Diskin, Mr. Michael A. Miller, Mr. John S. Watson, Mr. James H. Vander Weide, Dr. Edward L. Spitznagel, Jr., Mr. Paul Herbert, and Mr. Monty L. Bishop were filed along with the Petition.

TAWC's *Petition* was considered at a regularly scheduled Authority Conference held on September 27, 2004, at which time the panel voted unanimously to suspend the proposed rate increase for ninety (90) days, from October 10, 2004 to January 7, 2005 and to appoint the Authority's General Counsel or his designee as Hearing Officer in the proceeding to hear preliminary matters prior to the Hearing, to rule on any petitions for intervention, and to set a procedural schedule to completion.

On October 1, 2004, the Consumer Advocate filed a *Petition to Intervene* in this proceeding, which was granted by the Hearing Officer on October 11, 2004.⁷ On October 25, 2004, CMA filed its *Petition to Intervene by the Chattanooga Manufacturers Association* and on October 26, 2004, Chattanooga filed its *Petition to Intervene*. In an Order issued on October 28, 2004, the Hearing Officer granted both petitions for intervention.

Following discovery in the form of interrogatories and requests for production of documents, the intervening parties submitted pre-filed direct testimony as follows. Chattanooga filed the direct testimony of Mr. Trevor Hamilton, Ms. Daisy Madison and Mr. James "Tony" Quarles; CMA filed the direct testimony and exhibit of Mr. Michael Gorman, Mr. Jack Callaghan and Mr. Dan Nuckolls, and the Consumer Advocate filed the direct testimony of Dr. Steve N. Brown, Mr. Michael D. Crysler, and Mr. Terry Buckner. Rebuttal testimony of Mr. Paul T. Diskin, Mr. Michael A. Miller, Mr. John S.

⁷ See Order Granting Petition For Intervention And Establishing Procedural Schedule (October 11, 2004)

Watson, Dr. James H. Vander Weide and Mr. Paul Herbert was filed by TAWC. CMA filed rebuttal testimony of Mr. Michael Gorman.

On December 15, 2004, the Hearing Officer ordered that the proposed rate increase, which was initially suspended on September 27, 2004, should be re-suspended through March 9, 2005 or until the panel acted on the merits of the *Petition*, whichever occurred first. A Hearing was scheduled in this Docket to begin on January 31, 2005.

On January 27, 2005, TAWC and the Consumer Advocate filed the Settlement Agreement relating to specific issues and in which those parties stipulated to the following.

- 1. The Parties stipulate and agree that Tennessee-American is entitled to earn a 7.76% return on investments with a 9.9% return on equity, as shown in attached Schedule 9.
- 2. The Parties further stipulate and agree that a 7.76% return on investment generates a revenue deficiency of \$297,005. The revenue deficiency is shown in attached Schedule 1.
- 3. The Parties further stipulate and agree that Tennessee-American shall withdraw its request for the "Low Income Tariff" as referenced and described in paragraph 13 of its <u>Petition</u>.
- 4. The Parties further stipulate and agree that Tennessee-American shall measure and report service metrics as summarized in attached Schedule 10.
- 5. The Parties further stipulate and agree that the increase in rates attributable to the revenue deficiency of \$297,005 shall be allocated to all classes of customers in an across-the-board percentage increase of 0.93% to the metered tanffs, as shown in attached Schedule 11.
- 6. In light of the General Assembly's enactment of Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-5-101(d)(2004) prohibiting privately-owned water utilities from charging municipal governments for fire hydrant service, the Attorney General and Tennessee-American further stipulate and agree that public fire hydrant service charges of \$897,285 approved by the Tennessee Regulatory Authority ("TRA") in TRA Docket No. 03-00118 to be allocated to municipal governments shall be allocated to all classes of customers exclusive of municipal

governments in an across-the-board percentage increase of 2.90% to the metered tariffs, as shown in attached schedule 11...

The Hearing

The Hearing in this matter was held before the voting panel assigned to this Docket on January 31, 2005. Participating in the Hearing were the following parties and their respective counsel:

Tennessee American Water Company - R. Dale Grimes, Esq. and J. Davidson French, Esq., Bass, Berry and Sims, PLC, 315 Deaderick Street, AmSouth Center, Suite 2700, Nashville, Tennessee 37238-3001;

Consumer Advocate and Protection Division – Timothy C. Phillips, Esq. and Joe Shirley, Esq., Office of the Attorney General, P.O. Box 20207, Nashville, Tennessee 37202;

Chattanooga Manufacturers Association – Kristy Godsey, Esq., Boult, Cummings, Conners & Berry, PLC, 1600 Division St., #700, Nashville, Tennessee 37203 and David C. Higney, Esq., Grant, Konvalinka & Harrison, P.C., 633 Chestnut Street, 9th Floor, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37450; and

City of Chattanooga, Tennessee - Michael A. McMahan, Esq. and Phillip A. Noblett, Esq., Special Counsel, 801 Broad Street, Suite 400, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402.

At the Hearing, the parties presented information to the panel regarding the Settlement Agreement. At the time of the Hearing, TAWC and the Consumer Advocate had signed the Settlement Agreement and, although Chattanooga and CMA had not signed the Settlement Agreement at the time of the Hearing, they confirmed their intent to become signatories. Additionally, at the time of the Hearing, the Settlement Agreement contained an error which the parties agreed to delete. Specifically, the Settlement Agreement presented at the Hearing contained language in numbered paragraph 6 on page 2 that stated, "... allocated to all classes of customers exclusive of municipal governments in an across-the-board percentage increase" The parties agreed that the language in paragraph 6 should not have contained the phrase "exclusive of municipal governments."

After hearing from all the parties, the panel voted unanimously to accept the *Settlement Agreement* contingent on the aforementioned correction and all parties becoming signatories. By acceptance of the *Settlement Agreement*, the Authority determined the rate base to be \$87,611,390, the return on investment to be 7.76% and the return on equity to be 9.9%. Additionally, the panel voted unanimously to authorize the Hearing Officer to dispense with a written motion by TAWC to end the suspension of the rate increase proposed in the *Petition*. On February 4, 2005, consistent with the panel's decision, the parties filed a corrected *Settlement Agreement* signed by all parties.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. The *Proposed Settlement Agreement* filed by the Tennessee American Water Company, the Consumer Advocate and Protection Division of the Office of the Attorney General of Tennessee, Chattanooga Manufacturers Association and the City of Chattanooga, Tennessee, attached hereto as <u>Exhibit A</u>, is accepted and approved and is incorporated into this Order as if fully rewritten herein.

2. The Hearing Officer is authorized to dispense with any written motion by TAWC to end the suspension of the proposed rate increase.

Pat Miller, Chairman

Deborah Taylor Tate Director

Sara Kyle, Director

RECEIVED

IN THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 2005 FEB - 4 Ph 2: 34

IN RE:	•	T.R.A. DOCKET ROOM
IIV KE.)	
PETITION OF TENNESSEE-AMERICAN)	DOCKET NO. 04-00288
WATER COMPANY TO CHANGE AND)	
INCREASE CERTAIN RATES AND)	
CHARGES SO AS TO PERMIT IT TO EARN A)	
FAIR AND ADEQUATE RATE OF RETURN)	
ON ITS PROPERTY USED AND USEFUL IN)	
FURNISHING WATER SERVICE TO ITS)	
CUSTOMERS)	

PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

For the sole purpose of settling the case of <u>Petition of Tennessee-American Water Company</u> to Change and Increase Certain Rates and Charges So as to Permit It to Earn a Fair and Adequate Rate of Return on its Property Used and Useful in Furnishing Water Service to its Customers, TRA Docket No. 04-00288, the Office of Attorney General through the Consumer Advocate and Protection Division ("Attorney General"), the City of Chattanooga ("City"), the Chattanooga Manufacturers Association ("CMA"), and Tennessee-American Water Company ("Tennessee-American") (collectively, the "Parties") hereby agree and stipulate as follows in the above-styled case set for hearing on January 31, 2005:

- 1. The Parties stipulate and agree that Tennessee-American is entitled to earn a 7.76% return on investments with a 9.9% return on equity, as shown in attached Schedule 9.
- 2. The Parties further stipulate and agree that a 7.76% return on investment generates a revenue deficiency of \$297,005. The revenue deficiency is shown in attached Schedule 1.

- 3. The Parties further stipulate and agree that Tennessee-American shall withdraw its request for the "Low Income Tariff" as referenced and described in paragraph 13 of its <u>Petition</u>.
- 4. The Parties further stipulate and agree that Tennessee-American shall measure and report service metrics as summarized in attached Schedule 10.
- 5. The Parties further stipulate and agree that the increase in rates attributable to the revenue deficiency of \$297,005 shall be allocated to all classes of customers in an across-the-board percentage increase of 0.93% to the metered tariffs, as shown in attached Schedule 11.
- 6. In light of the General Assembly's enactment of Tenn. Code Ann. § 65-5-101(d) (2004) prohibiting privately-owned water utilities from charging municipal governments for fire hydrant service, the Parties further stipulate and agree that public fire hydrant service charges of \$897,285 approved by the Tennessee Regulatory Authority ("TRA") in TRA Docket No. 03-00118 to be allocated to municipal governments shall be allocated to all classes of customers in an across-the-board percentage increase of 2.90% to the metered tariffs, as shown in attached Schedule 11.
- 7. The Parties further stipulate and agree that Tennessee-American shall submit with its next rate case petition a cost of service study in the same form as that submitted by Dr. Herbert in Tennessee-American's last rate case, TRA Docket No. 03-00118. The Parties further stipulate and agree that in any future proceeding each Party reserves its right to proffer its own testimony and evidence regarding the sufficiency, conclusions, weight and relevancy of such cost of service study.
- 8. In the event that the TRA does not accept the Proposed Settlement in whole or in part, the Parties are not bound by any position set forth herein.

CONSUMER ADVOCATE AND TENNESSEE-AMERICAN WATER PROTECTION DIVISION OF THE OFFICE OF THE TENNESSEE ATTORNEY GENERAL R. Dale Grimes (BPR #6223) BASS, BERRY & SIMS PLC BY: Timothy C. Phillips (BPR #12751) (615) 742-6200 Senior Counsel (615) 741-3533 Joe Shirley (BPR #22287) J. Davidson French (BPR #15442) Assistant Attorney General BASS, BERRY & SIMS PLC (615) 741-3549 (615) 742-6200 CHATTANOOGA MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION// Michael A. McMahan (BPR #810 BY: Special Counsel Henry M. Walker (BPR/#282) (423) 757-5338 BOULT, CUMMINGS, CONNERS & BERRY (615) 252-2363 BY: David C. Higney (BPR #14888)

GRANT, KONVALINKA & HARRISON

(423) 756-8400

Dated: February 3, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and exact copy of the foregoing has been forwarded by facsimile and/or first-class mail, postage prepaid on February 476, 2005, to the following:

T.G. Pappas, Esq.
R. Dale Grimes, Esq.
J. Davidson French, Esq.
Bass, Berry & Sims, PLC
AmSouth Center
315 Deaderick Street, Suite 2700
Nashville, TN 37238-3001

Michael A. McMahan, Esq. Lawrence W. Kelly, Esq. Nelson, McMahan & Noblett 801 Broad Street, Suite 400 Chattanooga, TN 37402

Henry M. Walker, Esq. Boult, Cummings, Conners & Berry, PLC 1600 Division Street, Suite 700 Nashville, TN 37203

David C. Higney, Esq. Grant, Konvalinka & Harrison, P.C. 633 Chestnut Street, 9th Floor Chattanooga, TN 37450

TIMOTHY C. PHILLIPS

Sernor Counsel

#81968

Tennessee-American Water Index to Schedules For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

	Schedule No.
Revenue Deficiency	1
Comparative Rate Base	2
Income Statement at Current Rates	3
Income Statement at Proposed Rates	4
Operation & Maintenance Expenses	5
Taxes Other Than Income Taxes	6
Excise and Income Taxes	7
Revenue Conversion Factor	8
Cost of Capital	9
Service Metrics	10
Rate Design	11

Tennessee-American Water Revenue Deficiency For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line No.		CAPD •	Company	Difference
1	Rate Base	87,611,390 A/	87,611,390 A/	-
2	Operating Income at Present Rates	6,616,813 B/	5,846,425 B/	770,388
3	Earned Rate of Return (Line 2/Line 1)	7.55%	6 67%	0 88%
4	Cost of Capital	7.76% C/	7 997% E/	-0 24%
5	Required Operating Income (Line 1*Line 4)	6,798,644	7,006,283	(207,639)
6	Operating Income Deficiency (Line 5-Line 2)	181,830	1,159,858	(978,027)
7	Gross Revenué Conversion Factor	1 633418 D/	1 69890763 E/	(0.065490)
8	Revenue Deficiency (Line 6*Line 7)	297,005	1,970,491	(1,673,486)

A/ Schedule 2

B/ Schedule 3

C/ Schedule 9

D/ Schedule 8

E/ Diskin REVISED Exhibit 1, Schedule 1

Tennessee-American Water Comparative Rate Base For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line No.		CAPD	A/ Company A	V Difference
1	Utility Plant in Service	160,157,718	160,157,718	
2	Construction Work in Progress	801,659	801,659	-
3	Utility Plant Capital Lease	1,590,500	1,590,500	-
4	Limited-Term Utility Plant - Net	(3,270)	(3,270)	-
5	Working Capital	1,385,205	1,385,205	-
6	Def Maint	5,641	5,641	
7	Total Additions	163,937,453	163,937,453	-
8	Accumulated Depreciation	51,928,414	51,928,414	-
9	Accumulated Amort of Utility Capital Lease	742,234	742,234	-
10	Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes	13,486,419	13,486,419	-
11	Customer Advances for Construction	2,432,851	2,432,851	-
12	Contributions In Aid of Construction	7,765,092	7,765,092	-
13	Unamortized Investment Tax Credit	45,733	45,733	-
14	RWIP	(74,680)	(74,680)	_
15	Total Deductions	76,326,063	76,326,063	
16	Rate Base	87,611,390	87,611,390	_

A/ Company Exhibit 1, Sch 2

Tennessee-American Water Income Statement at Current Rates For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line No		CAPD *		Company		Difference
1	Operating Revenues	33,057,417	A/	33,057,417	A/	-
2	Operations and Maintenance Expense	16,262,091	B/	16,709,359	B/	(447,268)
3	Depreciation and Amortization Expense	4,558,016	C/	4,558,016	C/	-
4	Taxes Other Than Income	3,314,870	D/	3,456,977	G/	(142,107)
5	State Excise Tax	170,901	E/	378,505	H/	(207,604)
6	Federal Income Tax	2,163,517	E/_	2,136,926	H/_	26,591
7	Total Operating Expense	26,469,395		27,239,783		(770,388)
8	AFUDC	28,791	F/_	28,791	. F/ _	<u> </u>
9	Net Operating Income for Return	6,616,813		5,846,425	. =	770,388

A/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch 2

B/ Schedule 5

C/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch. 1

D/ Schedule 6

E/ Schedule 7

F/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch 3

G/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch 1, but does not tie to Company's supporting workpapers (See Sch. 6)

H/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch. 6

Tennessee-American Water Income Statement at Proposed Rates For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line No.		Current Ra t es	Adjustments	C/	Proposed Rates
1	Operating Revenues		B/ 297,005	_	32,819,737
2	Forfeited Discount Revenues	534,685_E	B/ 4,990		539,675
3	Total Revenues	33,057,417	301,995	= =	33,359,412
4	Operations and Maintenance Expense	16,262,091	2,809		16,264,900
5	Depreciation and Amortization Expense	4,558,016			4,558,016
6	Taxes Other Than Income	3,314,870			3,314,870
7	State Excise Tax	170,901	19,447		190,348
8	Federal Income Tax	2,163,517	97,909	_	2,261,425
9	Total Operating Expense	26,469,395		_	26,589,559
10	AFUDC	28,791		_	28,791
11	Net Operating Income for Return	6,616,813		=	6,798,644

A/ Schedule 3

B/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch. 2

C/ Schedule 1, Line 8 x appropriate factor from Schedule 8

Tennessee-American Water Operation & Maintenance Expenses For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line No		CAPD A	Company B/	Difference
1	Salaries and Wages	4,082,080	4,383,883	(301,803)
2	Purchased Water	26,148	15,330	10,818
3	Fuel and Power	1,650,433	1,755,680	(105,247)
4	Chemicals	861,861	861,861	-
5	Waste Disposal	118,201	133,438	(15,237)
6	Management Fees	3,219,932	3,062,940	156,992
7	Group Insurance	1,339,248	1,386,004	(46,756)
8	Pensions	829,731	892,790	(63,059)
9	Regulatory Expense	58,000	58,000	-
10	Insurance Other Than Group	673,430	657,000	16,430
11	Customer Accounting	570,625	572,893	(2,268)
12	Uncollectible Expense	289,530	289,530	-
13	Rents	37,888	38,286	(398)
14	General Office Expense	208,057	193,122	14,935
15	Miscellaneous Expense	1,715,487	1,661,970	53,517
16	Other Maintenance Expense	581,440	746,632	(165,192)
17	Total O&M Expense	16,262,091	16,709,359	(447,268)

A/ CAPD Workpapers

B/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch. 3

Tennessee-American Water Taxes Other Than Income Taxes For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line No		CAPD		Company D)/ Difference
1	Other General Taxes	900		900	
2	Gross Receipts Tax	356,815	A/	566,595	(209,780)
3	TRA inspection Fee	59,413		59,413	-
4	Property Taxes	2,300,000	B/	2,503,629	(203,629)
5	Franchise Tax	259,938		259,938	-
6	FICA Taxes	332,999	C/	332,999	-
7	Unemployment Taxes	4,805	C/	4,805	
8	Total Taxes Other Than Income Taxes	3,314,870		3,728,279	(413,409)

A/ CAPD Workpaper T-OTAX2

B/ CAPD Workpaper T-OTAX1

C/ CAPD Workpaper T-OTAX3

D/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch. 5 adjusted by Company Response to CAPD Data Request #17

Tennessee-American Water Excise and Income Taxes For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line		Attrition	
No	•	Amount A/	
1	Operating Revenues	33,057,417	B/
·			
2	Salaries and Wages	4,082,080	
3	Purchased Water	26,148	
4	Fuel and Power	1,650,433	
5	Chemicals	861,861	
6	Waste Disposal	118,201	
7	Service Company Charges	3,219,932	
8	Group Insurance	1,339,248	
9	Pensions	829,731	
10	Regulatory Expense	58,000	
11	Insurance Other Than Group	673,430	
12	Customer Accounting	570,625	
13	Uncollectible Expense	289,530	
14	Rents	37,888	
15	General Office Expense	208,057	
16	Miscellaneous Expense	1,715,487	
17	Other Maintenance Expense	581,440	
18	Depreciation and Amortization Expense	4,558,016	
19	Taxes Other Than Income	3,314,870	
20	NOI Before Excise and Income Taxes	8,922,440	
21	AFUDC	28,791	
.22	Interest Expense	(3,200,900)	C/
23	Pre-tax Book Income	5,750,331	
24	Schedule M Adjustments	(4,479,690)	D/
25	Excise Taxable Income	1,270,641	
26	Excise Tax Rate	6.50%	
27	Excise Tax Payable	82,592	
28	Excise Tax Deferred	88,309	
29	Excise Tax Expense	170,901	
30	Pre-tax Book Income	5,750,331	
31	Preferred Dividend Credit	(28,824)	E/
32	Excise Tax	(170,901)	
33	Schedule M Adjustments	(4,479,690)	D/
34	FIT Taxable Income	1,070,917	
35	FIT Rate	35 00%	
36	Federal Income Tax Payable	374,821	
37	ITC Amortization	(76,368)	
38	Federal Income Tax Deferred	1,865,064	
39	Federal Income Tax Expense	2,163,517	

- A/ Schedule 5
- B/ Schedule 4
- C/ Schedule 1, line 1 * Weighted Cost of Debt per Schedule 9
- D/ This is the net difference of the Permanent Differences of \$2,950 and the Temporary Differences of \$4,482,640 shown on E/
- E/ Exhibit No. 2, Schedule 6, Page 2 of 2

Tennessee-American Water Revenue Conversion Factor For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line No.	Operating Revenues	•	Amount	-	Balance 1 000000
2	Add: Forfeited Discounts		0 0168	A/	0.016800
3	Balance				1.016800
4	Uncollectible Ratio		0 0093	B/	0.009456
5	Balance				1.007344
6	State Excise Tax		0 0650	C/	0.065477
7	Balance				0 941866
8	Federal Income Tax		0 3500	C/	0 329653
9	Balance				0 612213
10	Revenue Conversion Factor (Line 1 / Line 11)				1.633418

A/ Company Exhibit 2, Sch. 2 (\$534,685/\$31,840,192) B/ Company Workpapers

C/ Statutory Rate

Tennessee-American Water Cost of Capital For the 12 Months Ending December 31, 2005

Line No 1 2	Parent Short Term Debt Long Term Debt	Ratio 6.30% 42.30%	• Cost 2 40% 6 00% 5 00%	O.15% 2 54% 0.02%	Tax Deductible 0 12% 2 05%
3	Preferred Equity	0 30% 51 10%	9 90%	5 06%	
4	Common Equity		3 30 70		
5	Total	100 00%		7.77%	
	Tennessee American.	Ratio	Cost	Weighted Cost	
6	Short Term Debt	0 00%	0 00%	0 00%	
7	Long Term Debt	19 20%	7 7 1%	1 48%	1.48%
8	Common Equity	80.80%	7 77%	6.28%	
9	Total	100 00%		7.76%	3.65%
	Final Capital Structure Parent	Ratio	Cost	Weighted Cost	Tax Deductible
10	Short Term Debt	5 09%	2 40%	0.12%	0.12%
11	Long Term Debt	34.18%	6.00%	2.05%	2.05%
12	Preferred Equity	0.24%	5.00%	0.01%	
13	Common Equity	41.29%	9 90%	4.09%	
	Total Parent	80 80%	7.76%	6.27%	
	Tennessee American				
14	Short Term Debt	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
15	Long Term Debt	19.20%	7 71%	1.48%	1 48%
16	Total Subsidiary	19.20%	7 71%	1 48%	
17	Total	100 00%		7.75%	3.65%

Source Exhibit CAPD-SB, Schedules 37 and 38

TENNESSEE AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

Settlement Agreement Regarding Service Metrics and Reporting TRA Docket # 04-00288 January 27, 2005 SCHEDULE 10.

Customer Service - Call Center:

- 1. Begin Reporting Monthly Customer Care Scorecard (as identified in Mike Miller's Rebuttal Testimony) on a monthly basis and reporting to the Tennessee Regulatory Authority (TRA), the CAPD by March 1, 2005.
- 2. Develop similar Monthly Customer Care Scorecard with "Tennessee Specific" Statistics reporting by January 1, 2006 to TRA and CAPD. TAWC is not currently able to measure dropped calls from TN ratepayers, but will work with the Consumer Advocate toward establishing the necessary mechanisms to measure dropped calls, if practicable.

Tennessee Local Operations:

- 3. TAWC Employee Reporting by job title with its quarterly reporting to the TRA including allocated Tennessee specific Call Center employees.
- 4. Field Service (Tennessee Office) Monthly Reporting To TRA and CAPD by March 1, 2005
 - A. Service Orders Worked Monthly
 - B. Appointment Orders % on-time
 - C. Appointments Missed
 - D. Meter Reading
 - a. Total meters
 - b. Meters read
 - c. Estimates
 - d. % Estimated
 - e. Number of Meters not billed 3 months, 6 months, 12 months

Customer Surveys:

- 5. Customer Survey Responses Reported To TRA and CAPD On A Quarterly Basis beginning 2005) detailed by affiliate:
 - A. Satisfaction in Reaching American Water Call Center
 - B. Satisfaction with Call Center Operation Problem Resolution
 - C. Satisfaction with company response for service
 - D. Satisfaction with water quality

Tennessee American Water Company Rate Design - Docket #04-00288

		₹	Fire	Fire Hydrant					
		Present		Shift	Post Shift	%	Increase	%	Total
Residential	₩	13,302,692	ક્ક	385,753 \$	13,688,445	2 90% \$	127,686	\$ %860	13,816,131
Commercial		9,464,969		274,466	9,739,435	2 90%	90,849	0.93%	9,830,285
Industrial		3,399,370		98,575	3,497,945	2 90%	32,629	0 93%	3,530,574
Other Public Authority		2,500,771		72,518	2,573,289	2 90%	24,004	0.93%	2,597,292
Sales for Resale		920,714		26,699	947,413	2 90%	8,837	0 93%	956,250
Private Fire		1,354,352		39,274	1,393,626	2.90%	13,000	0 93%	1,406,625
Public Fire		897,285		(897,285)		-100.00%		%00 0	1
Total	ss	31,840,153	s	\$	31,840,153	0.00%	297,005	\$ %860	93% \$ 32,137,158

A/ TAWC witness Herbert Exhibit

			TENNESSEE-AMERICAN WATER COMPANYSES CASE NO. DIRECT TESTIMONY Paul T. Diskin Paul T. Diskin Paul T. DISKIN Paul T. DISKIN NAME AND BUSINESS
1			TENNESSEE-AMERICAN WATER COMPANYS
2			CASE NO & R.4 \ A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
3			Paul T. Diskin
5			ROOM
6	1.	Q.	WILL YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS
7			ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD?
8		Α.	My name is Paul T. Diskin and my business address is 800 W
9			Hershey Park Drive, Hershey, PA 17033.
10			
11	2.	Q.	BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT
12			CAPACITY?
13		Α.	I am employed by American Water as the Manager of Rates and
14			Regulations.
15			
6	3.	Q.	WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES IN THIS POSITION?
17		A .	I supervise and coordinate the preparation of data and various
18			exhibits in rate matters as well as maintaining and administering
19			the Company's tariffs. I also present testimony in formal rate
20			cases and other regulatory proceedings. I have testified in the
21			various Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission proceedings
22			which are listed in Appendix A and B.
23			
24			
25	4.	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL
26			BACKGROUND AND BUSINESS EXPERIENCE?

I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Business

Administration with a dual concentration in Accounting and

Management from Clarion State College in December of 1977. In

December of 1992, I was awarded an MBA from York College of

Pennsylvania. I have completed the continuing education

program conducted by the National Association of Regulatory

Utility Commissioners (NARUC) and the University of Utah. In

addition, I am a Certified Management Accountant (CMA)

recognized by the Institute of Management Accountants. I also

serve as the Chairman of the Rates and Revenue Committee of
the Pennsylvania Chapter of the National Association of Water

Companies.

My experience in the water utility industry began in 1979 when I was employed as a Junior Accountant in the Continuing Property Records Section of the American Water Works Service Company, Inc. My principal duties were to process investment and retirement work orders and to record additions and retirements of utility plant in the subsidiary ledgers of the various districts of the Company's predecessor corporations. Later in the same year, I was assigned to the Rates and Revenue Section to aid in the preparation of rate filings. In 1980, I was promoted to the

1			position of Rate Analyst I, and in 1981 was promoted to Rate
2			Analyst II. Effective January 1982, I was promoted to the
3			position of Revenue Requirement Specialist. On July 1, 1988, I
4			became Assistant Director of Rates and Revenue for the
5			Pennsylvania Region. Effective January 1, 1993, I was
6			transferred to Pennsylvania-American. On July 1, 2001, I became
7			Director of Rates and Planning. Effective July 15, 2004, I was
8			appointed as Manager of Rates and Regulations for the Southeast
9			Region of American Water.
10	5.	Q.	WAS THE COMPANY'S ACCOUNTING EXHIBITS
11			PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION?
12		A.	Yes, they were.
13			·
14	6.	Q.	WHAT IS THE SOURCE OF THE INFORMATION USED IN
15			THE COMPANY'S ACCOUNTING EXHIBITS?
16		A.	The information contained in the Accounting Exhibits was
17			prepared from the financial and operational records of the
18			Company.
19			
20	7.	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE INCREASE IN RATES THAT THE
21			COMPANY IS SEEKING IN THIS PROCEEDING?
22		A.	The Company is seeking a rate increase that would produce
23			additional annual revenues of \$1.9 million or 5.9%. The
24			Company last filed for a rate increase in 2003.

8. Q. WHAT ARE THE TEST YEAR AND ATTRITION YEAR SELECTED BY THE COMPANY FOR THIS FILING?

3

5

6

7 8

11

12

13

4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

Α.

A. The Company has selected the twelve months ending March 31, 2004, as its test year and an attrition year starting on January 1, 2005 and ending December 31, 2005.

9 9. Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS
10 CASE?

My testimony will 1) sponsor the Company's Α. Accounting Exhibits Nos. 1, 2, and 3 which support the proposed revenue increase of \$1,970,887 and 2) support the Company's attrition year level of Revenue, Labor, Fuel and Power, Chemicals, Waste Disposal, Group Insurance, Regulatory Expense, Insurance Other than Group, Uncollectible Expense, Rents, General Office Expense, Miscellaneous Expense, Other Maintenance Expense, AFUDC, General Taxes and Rate Base. Next, I will address the Company's proposed rate base shown on Exhibit No. 1, Schedule 2, consisting of 3 pages. Then, I will address the Company's proposed Computation of Working Capital shown on Exhibit No. 1, Schedule 3, consisting of six pages. I will also address the Company's Operating Revenues Per Books for the Test Year and for the Attrition Year under both Present and Proposed Rates, except for average daily usages for both the residential and commercial customer classes.

10. Q. WHO WILL ADDRESS THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED AVERAGE DAILY USAGE FOR THE RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL CUSTOMER CLASSES?

A. The Company has retained the services of Dr. Edward L. Spitnagel, Jr., Professor, Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, to provide weather normalizations for both the residential and commercial customer classes. I will explain how Dr. Spitnagel's averages were used in the Company's bill analysis.

11. Q. WHAT IS THE TEST PERIOD REFLECTED IN THIS CASE?

- A. The Company has used a historical test period of twelve months ending March 31, 2004. The Company has adjusted the test period for two levels of adjustments. The first adjustment normalizes the test year. The second level adjusts the normalized year to arrive at the attrition year which is the twelve months ended December 31, 2005.
- 12. Q. MR. DISKIN, ARE THERE ANY EXHIBITS YOU WISH TO SPONSOR BEFORE YOU CONTINUE?
 - A. Yes, I would like to give a brief description of the accounting schedules which detail and support the rate base, revenues, expenses, and capitalization for the test year and attrition year.
 - Exhibit 1 is a financial summary of the filing which details how the Company arrived at the amount of the requested revenue increase. There is also a rate base summary for the test year and attrition year with supporting schedules.
 - Exhibit 2 is an operating income summary for the test year and attrition year with supporting schedules broken down by major

account group.

Exhibit 3 provides a cost of capital summary for the attrition year and supporting schedules which provide detail on each component of the capital structure.

14. Q. HOW DID THE COMPANY DETERMINE THE OPERATING REVENUES SHOWN IN ITS ACCOUNTING EXHIBIT?

A. The Company's operating revenues are obtained from (i) metered sales, (ii) private and public fire service, and (iii) miscellaneous, service revenues, rents from property, and other water revenues.

(i) Metered Sales

The Company uses a bill analysis reflecting the actual billing determinants for the test year, twelve months ended March 31, 2004. Exhibit No. 4, Schedules 1 and 2, sets forth the individual bill analysis by customer classes. This schedule multiplies attrition year billing determinants by present and proposed rates.

15. Q. DID THE COMPANY MAKE ANY ADJUSTMENTS TO PER BOOK REVENUES FOR THE TEST YEAR?

A. Yes, the Company made a total of four adjustments, as follows:

(1) weather normalization adjustment for the residential and commercial customer classes, (2) eliminated net change in accrued revenues, (3) annualization of the rate increase that became effective August, 2003 and (4) added revenue for the estimated number of new customers to be added during the attrition year. The estimate is based on historical results. The reasons for these adjustments are identified in the Company's work papers that are

1			med under separate cover.
) 2	16.	Q.	HOW WERE THE OPERATING EXPENSE ADJUSTMENTS
3			IN THE ACCOUNTING EXHIBIT CALCULATED?
4			A. The adjustments reflect an ongoing level of operating
5			expenses consistent with the test year matching principles.
6			Known and measurable price adjustments have been included to
7			restate test year expense levels to rate year levels, the first 12-
8			month period in which new rates will be in effect.
9			
10	17.	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR TESTIMONY ON THE ISSUE OF COMPANY
11			LABOR EXPENSE?
12		A.	I will address the methodology used by the Company in
13		124	developing the Going-level provision for labor expense.
14			
15	18.	Q.	HOW DID THE COMPANY CALCULATE GOING-LEVEL
16			LABOR EXPENSE IN ITS COST OF SERVICE?
17		A.	The Company calculated labor expense by individual employee.
18			Each employee's wages during the twelve months ended March
19			31, 2004 were adjusted to account for the wage level to be paid
20			during the first twelve-months in which the new rates will be in
21			effect. This is the same approach the Company has used in prior
22			filings.
23			
24	10	Ω	HOW WERE THE WACE LEVELS FOR THE ATTRITION

YEAR DETERMINED?

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Α.

For hourly employees, the hours worked during the test year were Α. Company's actual payroll the obtained from Adjustments were then made to overtime hours to restate those hours to a level equivalent to the employee's hourly pay rate. For example, the hours paid at time and a half wage rates were multiplied by 1.5 to yield hours that could be applied to the employee's hourly wage rate. Similar adjustments were made for other premium overtime hours. Each employee's equivalent hours were then applied to their average test year wage rate to determine going-level wages.

20. Q. HOW WERE THE AVERAGE RATE YEAR WAGE RATES CALCULATED?

For union employees, the Company's existing bargaining agreements were examined. The agreements contain negotiated wage rates through the attrition year. The wage rates for each pay class in effect for the attrition year were pro-rated based upon the number of days in the attrition year. The result is an average attrition year wage rate for each union employee.

For non-union hourly and clerical employees, current wage rates that became effective on April 1, 2003 were adjusted for wage

increases of 3% on April 1, 2004. As was done for union wage rates, the test year wage rate was calculated based upon the number of days each of those wages were in effect.

- 21. Q. HOW WERE THE ATTRITION YEAR WAGE LEVELS FOR SALARIED EMPLOYEES DETERMINED?
 - A. Salaried employees are exempt from overtime pay. For that reason, the current annual salary for each employee has been adjusted for wage increases that became effective on April 1, 2004. Consistent with the other employee classes, the 2004 salaries were calculated based upon the number of days each of the salary amounts would be in effect.

- 22. Q. WHAT IS THE BASIS UPON WHICH FUEL AND POWER COST WAS CALCULATED FOR THIS RATE ADJUSTMENT?
 - A. The basis for fuel and power is based upon expected water pumped to the system during the attrition year (system delivery), and its cost to pump and treat. Attrition year water sales, non-revenue usage water (which is water used for system flushing, street cleaning, sewer flushing, etc.) and an estimated unaccounted for water is combined to arrive at system delivery. Fuel and power is based on KWH's per million gallons system delivery.

Fuel and power costs are based on estimated KWH usage and KWD required to produce the projected system delivery for the attrition year. KWH's per thousand gallons is used to calculate energy charges. The KWH's per thousand gallons required is based on the latest 12 months actual, with adjustments for any known changes that will affect KWH usage. Both KWH and KWD usage is priced at the rates currently being charged by the Chattanooga Electric Power Board. The total attrition year fuel and power expense is \$ 1,755,680 which represents an increase of \$ 204,058 over the test year expense due to an increase in overall system delivery.

WHAT IS THE BASIS FOR THE CHEMICAL COSTS? 23. Q.

1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Chemical costs are based upon expected water pumped to the A. system (system delivery) for the attrition year and the cost to treat that water. Attrition year water sales, non-revenue usage (used for street cleaning, sewer flushing, etc.) and an estimated unaccounted for water is combined to arrive at system deliverly. System delivery, plus water used at the treatment plant, is combined to produce total treatment rate. The total attrition year chemical expense is \$861,861 which is an increase of \$121,330 over the test year expense due to the increase in system delivery.
- 24. 22 Q. WHAT IS THE BASIS FOR THE COST OF WASTE DISPOSAL?
- Α. Waste disposal is based upon the 2005 budget. This amount is 24 slightly higher than that during the test year. 25
- 25. O. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 26 ADJUSTMENT FOR GROUP INSURANCE.

The group insurance expense for the normalized test year was calculated first by determining the annualized group insurance cost. The cost is determined by applying the group insurance rates in effect at January 1, 2004 to the pro forma insurance coverages based upon the employee complement and salary and wage information. From this amount, an amount representing the employee contribution for their healthcare coverage is subtracted. The result is the Company's annualized group insurance cost.

A.

Since group insurance is an employee benefit, the cost for group insurance is charged based upon direct labor charges.

Since 16.61 percent of labor was not charged to expenses (as previously explained) this percentage of group insurance cost is excluded from the Company's claim for group insurance expense.

26. Q. ARE THERE ANY OTHER PAYROLL-RELATED EXPENSES?

A. Yes, there are. The Company's claim for payroll taxes is based on historic and future test year salary and wage expense. As is the case with group insurance, 16.61% of the calculated payroll taxes are eliminated, representing the portion not charged to operations.

- 27. Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COMPANY'S CLAIM FOR OPEBS.
- A. The Company's claim for OPEB expense represents the test year amount accrued of \$996,796 less the capitalized portion of \$114,043 or a net amount of \$882,753.

- 6 28. Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COMPANY'S PENSION
 7 ADJUSTMENT IN THIS CASE.
 - A. The Company participates with all its American Water Services ("AWS") affiliates in a system-wide Pension Plan. Its actuary, Towers Perrin, prepares the AWS's pension calculations. The Company's adjustment to pension expense is based on Towers Perrin's Actuarial Report for 2003-2004.

- 29. Q. MR. DISKIN, YOU LISTED A NUMBER OF OTHER EXPENSE CATEGORIES THAT YOU WILL BE SUPPORTING, WOULD YOU PLEASE DISCUSS EACH ONE?
 - A. Yes. Each of the following expense categories were reviewed for the test year and adjusted to reflect a normalized test year and further adjusted to an appropriate level of expense for the attrition year. Some of the expense categories were adjusted for an inflation factor of 3.3%.

30. Q. HOW DID YOU ARRIVE AT THE 3.3% INFLATION

FACTOR?

A. I used the Value Line Forecast for the US Economy Gross Domestic Product estimated inflation rate. For the attrition year, I used the annual amount of change of 3.3%.

31. O. PLEASE CONTINUE.

A. REGULATORY EXPENSE

The company has estimated the cost of the preparation and presentation of this current filing to be \$150,000. The Company is proposing to amortize these costs over a three year period resulting in an annual cost of \$50,000. Also, included in the attrition year cost is the Cost of Service Study Expense in the amount of \$40,000 which the company is proposing an amortization period of five years resulting in an annual cost of \$8,000. Total attrition year expense is \$58,000.

INSURANCE OTHER THAN GROUP

 The Company's proposed level for this expense for the attrition year is \$657,000 and is based on the Company's 2005 budget. This expense category includes costs for general liability, workers compensation, and property insurance.

CUSTOMER ACCOUNTING EXPENSE

Customer accounting expense for the test year was \$572,632. The Company applied the inflation factor of 3.3% to these expenses, excluding uncollectibles and postage to arrive at an increase of \$1,713.

This category includes costs associated with the customer billing and collecting function. It includes costs for office supplies, report forms, computer supplies, postage, collection agency fees, lock box expenses, janitorial service, telephone expense, and other miscellaneous customer accounting expense.

UNCOLLECTIBLE EXPENSE

The uncollectible percentage of .93% was derived by taking the net charge offs, less recoveries as a percentage of total revenues for the test year. The attrition year uncollectible expense is

ا ع

GENERAL OFFICE EXPENSE

General office expense for the test year was \$189,347. The inflation factor of 3.3% was applied to the remaining expenses (excluding postage) to arrive at an attrition year expense of \$193,122. This expense category includes costs associated with the general expenses for the offices. These include report forms, office supplies, computer supplies, overnight mail expenses, janitorial services, telephone expense, electrical expense, employee expenses, credit line fees, bank service charges, and other miscellaneous general office expenses.

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSE

Miscellaneous expense for the test year totaled \$1,596,601. The Company is proposing four adjustments to this category. The first adjustment reflects the inflation factor adjustment of 3.3%. This results in an increase of \$50,067. The Company did not apply the inflation factor to the Employee Stock Option Plan (ESOP) expense or the 401K expense.

The second adjustment eliminated the cost of temporary employees and normalized the test year. This resulted in a decrease of \$18,671.

The third adjustment was to include the cost of leasing vehicles for an amount of \$9,780. The Company is in the process of switching from purchasing vehicles to leasing vehicles.

The fourth adjustment is the amortization of the transition costs for the Shared Services Center and the Customer Call Center annualized for an entire year.

The proposed miscellaneous expense for the attrition year is \$1,661,970 which includes adjustments totaling \$(140,306)

MAINTENANCE EXPENSE

Maintenance expense for the test year was \$630,331. An adjustment was made to include the costs of preventative programs totaling \$92,450. The Company is proposing to

increase this total by \$23,851 to reflect the inflation factor to arrive at an attrition year balance of \$746,632.

This expense category includes costs associated with maintaining the property of the Company. This would include repair parts, tools, maintenance supplies, contracted services, paving, maintenance agreements, and other miscellaneous maintenance expenses.

AFUDC

The Company's proposed amount for AFUDC is \$28,791 and is based upon the 2005 budget. This adjustment was made to reflect the AFUDC as an above the line item for ratemaking purposes.

TAXES OTHER THAN INCOME PROPERTY TAXES

Property taxes for the test year were \$2,625,029. An additional amount was accrued during the last quarter of the test year to true-up the prior years' actual payment. This resulted in a normalized adjustment of (\$320,865). The attrition year adjustment of \$199,465 reflects the increase in the appraised value of the Company property through the attrition year.

GROSS RECEIPTS TAXES

Gross receipts tax was calculated based on projected jurisdictional revenues for Tennessee including Other Operating revenues. The result was reduced by Vendor's Compensation, Franchise Tax, Excise Tax, a \$5,000 exemption, and multiplied by the 3% tax rate.

PSC FEES

The PSC Inspection Fee was based on projected 2004 jurisdictional revenues. This was reduced by uncollectibles and a \$5,000 exemption to arrive at taxable revenues. The result is multiplied by the Tennessee statutory rates that were taken from the 2003 return.

FRANCHISE TAX

Franchise tax, as imposed by the state of Tennessee, applies to the company's apportioned net worth or value of property owned and

used in Tennessee, whichever is greater, as shown at the close of the corporation's fiscal year. The Franchise Tax is paid in arrears and is based on the previous years original cost of assets. For this filing, we utilized the balances as of March 31, 2004 as a basis for the tax and multiplied it by the statutory rate of \$.25 per \$100.

RATE BASE:

- 32. Q. HAS THE COMPANY CHANGED THE METHODOLOGY OF CALCULATING REQUESTED RATE BASE FROM THE APPROACH ADVOCATED IN ITS LAST CASE?
 - A. No, it has not. This is the same approach used and approved in Case No. 03-00118. Shown on Exhibit No. 1, Schedule 2, Column No. 1 of the Company's Accounting Exhibit, is the rate base for the historical test year totaling \$85,553,595. In Column No. 2, the Company has summarized it's requested ratemaking adjustments to rate base totaling \$2,057,796 over and above the historical test year. In Column number 3, the Company has shown its requested rate base for the mid-point of the Attrition Year, aggregating \$87,611,392.

- 33. Q. PLEASE DETAIL THE COMPONENTS THAT COMPRISE RATE BASE SHOWN ON EXHIBIT 1, SCHEDULE 2.
- A. <u>UTILITY PLANT IN SERVICE</u>
 Includes the actual undepreciat

Includes the actual undepreciated original cost of all land and land rights, easements, structures and improvements, together with equipment in service at March 31, 2004. To this actual March 31, 2004 balance, the budgeted cumulative effect of additions and retirements to Utility Plant for the Period January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005 have been reflected to arrive

at utility plant balance at the mid-point of the attrition year. These additions and retirements are summarized on Exhibit 1, Schedule 2, page 3 of 3 and are addressed in greater detail in Mr. Bishop's Direct Testimony.

CONSTRUCTION WORK IN PROGRESS

This amount is shown in both March 31, 2004 actual and December 31, 2005 budgeted balances. These amounts are representative of all actual or budget project work for utility plant that are not in service at December 31, 2005.

LIMITED-TERM UTILITY PLANT-NET

WORKING CAPITAL

Working capital shown on Exhibit 1, Schedule 2, is further detailed on Exhibit 1, Schedule 3, and I will explain those components that make-up working capital.

Average Cash

Average cash represents a monthly average which was computed based on 12 monthly averages of daily cash balances per bank statements for the year ended July 31, 2002. The monthly average was computed by dividing the total daily balances for the month by the same month's total days.

Prepaid Insurance, Prepaid Taxes, and Materials and Supplies

Prepaid insurance, prepaid taxes, and materials and supplies represent an average of the thirteen month end balances for the test year ending July 31, 2002.

Deferred Regulatory Expense

The deferred regulatory expense consists of an average of two cases unamortized balances at the September 30, 2003 attrition year mid point. The amounts included in rate base include \$187,000 for the current rate case expense and \$36,000 for the current Cost of Service Study.

Unamortized Debt Expense

Unamortized debt expense was calculated by starting with the July 31, 2002 unamortized debt expense and subtracting the cumulative amortizations to arrive at the balances of the beginning and ending of the attrition year. The average of these two balances, plus the unamortized debt expense of the proposed debt issue, result in a \$238,260 balance at the attrition year midpoint.

Other Deferred Debits

Other deferred debits consist of three items detailed below:

- Unamortized transition costs of the Customer Call Center which total \$915,709.
- Unamortized transition costs of the Shared Services Center which total \$343,096.
- Unamortized security costs which total \$250,458.

Lead-Lag Study

The Company is using a Lead/Lag Study that was performed based on historical data for the twelve months ending July 31, 2002, which includes a working capital allowance of \$525,000.

Incidental Collections

Incidental collections represent the average balance of funds for sewer billing and sales tax not yet remitted or paid for the 12

l			months ending July 31, 2002. The average balances resulting in a
2			reduction to rate base working capital for sewer billing and sales
3			tax are \$1,895,262 and \$85,819 respectively.
4			
5			RATE DESIGN
6	34.	Q.	HOW DID THE COMPANY DEVELOP THE TARIFF RATES
7			REQUESTED IN THIS CASE?
8		A.	The proposed tariff rates are based upon an across the board
9			increase.
10			
11	35.	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COMPANY'S ATTRITION LEVEL
12			OF INCOME TAXES?
13		A.	The Company's calculated level of Income Taxes for the attrition
14			year is the present rate amount of \$2,515,431. This is broken
15			down into three components:
16			1. Current provision for federal and state income taxes of
17			\$348,230 and \$65,347 as shown on pages 1 and 2 of
18			Accounting No. 2, Schedule 6.
19			2. Deferred federal and state income taxes of \$1,865,064 and
20			\$313,158 are also shown on pages 1 and 2 of Accounting
21			Exhibit No. 2, Schedule 6.
22			3. The annual amortization of the 3%, 4% and 10% is
23			(\$76,368) Investment tax credits for the test year.
24			
25	36.	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
26		A.	Yes, it does.

APPENDIX A

3		
4		
5		
6		DOCKET NO
7		
8		
9		
10	Pennsylvania-American Water Company (Wastewater)	R-00005212
11		R-00973973
12	Collection System Improvement Charge	R-00027982
13	Pennsylvania-American Water Company (Water)	
14	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	R-00038304
15	Facility Protection Charge	R-00027983
16		R-00964438
17		R-00973944
18		R-00943231
19		R-00932670
20		R-922428
21		R-911909
22		R-901652
23		R-891208
24		K 051200
25	Pennsylvania-American Water Company (Pre-merger)	R-880916
26	the state of the s	R 000710
27	Keystone Water Company	R-850245
28	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	R 630243
29	Berwick District	R-842759
30	Northeast Region	R-842755
31	Southern Central Region	R-842756
32	o	1 0 12/30
33	Riverton Consolidated Water Company	R-850153
34	• •	
35	Western Pennsylvania Water Company	R-870825
36		R-860397
37	Butler District	R-842624
38	Clarion-Punxsutawney District	R-842625
39	Indiana-Kane	R-842623
40	Warren District	R-842622
41		R-850097
42		10-650057
43	Western Region	R-842621
44	C .	R-850096
		11-030070

APPENDIX B FORMAL CUSTOMER COMPLAINT PROCEEDINGS 6 7 DOCKET NO. **COMPLAINTANT** 8 9 10 C-00971106 Gilbert 11 C-00981273 Drew 12 C-00992304 Sayegh 13 C-00992569 Waste Recycling 14 C-00003629 Ellis 15 C-00004511 Valvanno 16 C-20016173 Noll 17 C-00014733 Могга 18 C-20016207 Collier Township 19 C-00015337 Parks, et al 20 Z-015005197 Lamberton 21 22

TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

COUNTY OF DAUPHIN

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, duly commissioned and qualified in and for the State and County aforesaid, personally came and appeared Paul T. Diskin, being by me first duly sworn deposed and said that:

He is appearing as a witness on behalf of Tennessee-American Water Company before the Tennessee Regulatory Authority, and if present before the Authority and duly sworn, his testimony would set forth in the annexed transcript consisting of 21 pages.

Paul T Diskin

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 3rd day of September 2004.

Notary Public

My commission expires

NOTARIAL SEAL
Emily T. Hicks, Notary Public
Derry Township Dauphin County
My Commission Expires March 4, 2006



Test Year Tweive Months Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No. 1, Schedule 1 Page 1 of 1

, Authori	America
Regulatory	Tennessee
nnessee	mpany

	Description	Supporting Exhibit	Proposed Test Year
Rat	Rate Base	Exhibit 1, Schedule 2	\$87,611,392
ăO	Operating Income at Attrition Year Present Rales	Exhibit 2, Schedule 1	5,157,576
Ear	Eamed Rate of Return		5 890%
Rat	Rate of Retum	Exhibit 3, Schedule 1	8 263%
Rec	Required Operating Income		7,239,329
ådO	Operating Income Deficiency		2,081,753
Gro	Gross Revenue Deficiency Factor		1 69890763
Rev	Revenue Deficiency		3,536,706

Test Year Tweive Months Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No. 1, Schedule 2 Page 1 of 3

Fennessee Regulatory Authonty	Company Tennessee American Water	ocket No
Tennes	Compar	Docket

Rate Base at Mid-Point of Attrition	\$160,157,718	801,659	1,590,500	5,641	(3,270)	1,385,205	163,937,453		51,928,414	(74,680)	742,234	13,486,419	2,432,851	7,765,092	45,733	0	76,326,062	87,611,392
Adjustments	\$9,857,990	(2,258,326)		(4,645)	0	0	7,595,019		5,346,740	0	123,706	466,651	(633,789)	237,527	(3,612)	0	5,537,223	2,057,796
Per Books Rate Base @ 3/31/2004	\$150,299,728	3,059,985	1,590,500	10,286	(3.270)	1,385,205	156,342,435		46,581,674	(74,680)	618,528	13,019,768	3,066,640	7,527,564	49,345	0	70,788,839	85,553,595
Footnote <u>Reference</u>	3	(2)			(3)				(4)		(5)	(9)	6	(8)	(6)	(10)		
Additions	Utility Plant in Service (UPIS)	Construction Work in Progress	Utility Plant Capital Lease	Deferred Maintenance	Limited-Tem Utility Plant - Net	Working Capital	Total Additions	<u>Deductions</u>	Accumulated Provision for Depreciation UPIS	RWIP	Accumulated Amortization of Utility Plant Capital Lease	Deferred Income Taxes	Customer Advances for Construction	Contributions in Aid of Construction	Unamortized Investment Tax Credit	Utility Plant Acquisition Adjustment	Total Deductions	Rate Base

Attrition Year Rate Base Footnotes

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No 1, Schedule 2 Page 2 of 3

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company Tennessee American Water Docket No

DESCRIPTION	Net Additions to UPIS through December 31, 2005	Adjustment to CWIP through December 31, 2005	Adjustment to Deferred Maintenance	Adjustment to Limited -Term Utility Plant - Net	Adjustment to Accumulated Provision for Depreciation of UPIS	Adjustment to Accumulated Amortization of Utility Plant - Capital Lease	Adjustment to Deferred Income Taxes	Change in Customer Advances	Change in Contributions in Aid of Construction		Change in Unamortized Investment Tax Credit	Adjustment to Utility Plant Acquisition Adjustment																
FOOTNOTE REFERENCE	E	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(9)	(1)) (8)			(10)	(11)																
L No 9 2 4 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	9 2	- മൈന	1 10	12	4 4	16	. 2 5	20	21	23	24 25	52 58	27	82 62	3 8	31	32	33	34	35	37	38	39	40	4	42	43	F

45

(633,789)

123,706

5,346,740

(2,258,326)

\$9,857,990

AMOUNT

(3,612)

0

237,527

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No 1, Schedule 2 Page 3 of 3	Net Additions to	Utility Plant in	Service	80	. os	0\$	80	09	09	0, 0	05	\$151,450	0\$	00 00	0, 0,	000	0\$	0\$	\$190,000	000 055.4	\$2,840,787	0\$	08	\$0 \$552.214	08	\$423,583	\$1,762,851	/10,260¢	\$52,500	0\$	0/8/308	9 05	\$735 000	0.50	0\$	0.50	08	(\$33.500)	08	°so	08	50	\$187,443	0,00	\$0	\$0	•
Test Year Twelve		1/1/2005 to	5/37/2005	Shanahan	S	0\$	0.50	0%	0.00	0,00) C	0\$	0\$	0 6		9 9	0\$	05	0.6	0,0	\$13,100	0\$	08	0 0	o es	\$14,500	\$40,000	2 2	2 25	0\$	59 500 50	2 02	03	000.054	0\$	0.5	D (4)) A 4	0.5	0\$	05	0.0	2	0, 0,	0.5	8 0	•
		4/1/2004 to	12/31/2004	CHEMBIOSK	0.5	0\$	0\$	05	0.6	9	05	0\$	0\$	05	0.5	05	0\$	0\$	os s	0,00	\$62,300	0\$	0\$	\$0 80 80 80	05	0\$	0\$	000 98	\$3,500	03	511,000	05	0\$		0\$	0\$	0,0	\$33.500	0\$	0\$	0\$	0.5		0,00	0\$	0\$	
		1/1/2005 to	12/31/2005	Additions	9	0.5	o s	os ရ	9	2	2 0	\$40,450	03	္က	9 5	200	0\$	00	\$15,000	000,086,18	\$872,752	0\$	%	0 G	2 02	\$438,083	\$762,777	0, 0	S S	0\$	\$115,370	0,00	\$235,000	000 055	9	05	9 6	9 5	0,50	0 \$	0%	0\$	362 500) S	. O.S	S,	
		4/1/2004 to	12/31/2004	Additions	05	05	05	%	2 5	2 2	9	\$111,000	0.5	S 2	2 5	0,5	05	05	\$175,000) s	\$2,043,435	0\$	05	50	2/6,400.	0\$	\$1 040,074	715,8558	000 95\$	0.50	\$214,000	S S	\$500,000	6/6,/964	80	0\$	0\$	002,7216	05	0\$	0\$	05	\$124,945	, o	80	S	
ty in Water			Account	Organization	Land & Land Rights	Comprehensive Planning Study	Pumping Structures	Water Treatment Structures	Water I reaument Structures-Painting		Stores Shop & Garage Structures	Miscellaneous Structures	Lakes, Rivers, & Other Intakes	Flector Dumped Comment	Detail Tumping Equipment	Other Pumping Equipment	Water Treatment Equipment	Granular Activated Carbon	T & D Reservoirs & Standpipes	Floorated Tanks & Standards - Faining	T & D Mains not Classified	T & D Mains - Mains (4" or less)	T & O Mains - Mains (6" - 8")	T & D Mains - Mains (6" - 10")	T & O Mains - Mains (12" or More)	Services	Meters	Meters-metal Case/Oid Style Meters - Plastic Case	Meters - Metal Case/New Style	Meter Installations	Hydrants Other D/F oc	Office Fumiture	Computer & Penpheral Equipment	Computer & Penph Personal		Computer Software Personal	Computer Software Other	Code Once Equipment	Heavy Trucks	Automobiles	Transportation-Other	Stores Equipment	laboratory from ment	Power Operated Equipment	Communication Equipment	Communication Equipment-Telephone	
Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company Tennessee Amencan Water Docket No			Mimber	301 00	303 00	303 99	304 22	304 31	304 32	304 50	304 52	304 53	306 20	310 20	31123	31127	320 34	320 33	330 41	330 43				331 45			334 41	334 43	334 44	334 45	335 40	340 51	340 53	340 57	340 55	340 58	340 59	34152	341 53	341 54	341 55	342 50	344 50	345 50	346 51	346 53	
Tennessee Reg Company Tenn Docket No	Line	<u>o</u> : -	- ເ	• m	٧	2	6 0 1	~ a	0 0	, £	=	12	13	4 4	5 6	17	18	95	2 5	2 2	23	24	25	27	28	. 29	9,30	32	8	35	3.5	38	39	2 4	42	643	4 4	4 4	47	88	49	0. 4	25	53	¥	55	

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company. Tennessee American Water Docket No

Item	Amount
Average Cash	366,929
Prepaid insurance	92,558
Prepaid Taxes	234,228
Materials & Supplies	346,535
Deferred Regulatory Expenses	223,500
Unamortized Debt Expense	106,689
Other Deferred Debits	1,452,847
Lead - Lag Study	. 543,000
Total	3,366,286
Less	
Customer Deposits	0
Incidental Collections	1,981,081
Totai	1,981,081
Working Capital Requirement	1,385,205

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No 1, Schedule 3 Page 2 of 6

Amount	30,485,321	83,521					542,887	542,887	543,000
Days				42 07	35 57	6.5			
Description	Net Operating Funds	Average Daily Operating Funds	Composite Average Days Interval Between	(A) Date Service Furnished and Date Collections Deposited	(B) Date Expenses Incurred and Date of Payment	(C) Net Interval	Operating Funds Advanced	Lead/Lag Study Capital	Use

Composite Average Days Interval between Date Expenses are incurred and Date of Payment

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No 1, Schedule 3 Page 3 of 6

Comp
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
Company Tennessee Amencan Water
Docket No

<u> Dollar Days</u>	17,091,305 26,237,915 78,589,653 20,934,819 5,619,870	(11,182,451) (1,130,207) 0 (15,414,380) 264,486 (418,602) 6,568,832 6,568,832 1,234,875	75,774,559 0 4,853,016 571,762,599 8,324,667 2,513,385 0 2,613,89,062 6,263,600 1,084,277,203	
Post Payment or (Lead) <u>Days</u>	5 50 14 02 50 65 28 27 23 33 123	(4 46) (1 31) 0 00 (21 72) 9 24 (2 73) 24 77 0 000	20 51 0 00 10 61 174 52 37 00 58 63 0 00 87 48 0 00	35 57
Amount	3.107,510 1.871,463 1,551,622 740,531	2,507,276 862,553 387,895 709,686 28,624 153,334 265,193 0 51,951	3,694,518 16,112,307 4,121,753 457,400 3,276,201 224,991 42,872 1,092,221 3,055,531 70,000 1,832,045 30,485,321	urred and Date of Payment
Description	Payrolls Charged to Expense - Hourly Payrolls Charged to Expense - Salary Fuel and Power Chemicals Waste Disposal	AWWS Charges Group Insurance Pensions Insurance Other than Group Renis Telephone Expense Postage Expense Amortizations Stock E	Other Operating and Maintenance Expenses Total O & M Expenses Depreciation and Amortization Taxes, Other than income Payroll Other FIT-Current SIT-Current SIT-Current FIT-Current Solutions Neters Expenses Preferred Dividends Net Earnings Net Operating Funds	Average Days Interval between Date Expenses are incurred and Date of Payment
4 1 .				

Average Days Interval between Number of Days From Date Services are Furnished to Date Collections are Received

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company Tennessee American Water Docket No

Dollar Davs	427,134,524 (47,847,435) 379,287,089				
Median <u>Service Days</u>	15 21 (45 63)	13 02	4 62 24 43	42 07	
Revenues <u>Amount</u>	28,082,480 1,048,596 29,131,076	Average Median Service Days	Number of Days between the Reading Date and the Date the Bills are Mailed Number of Days between the Reading Date and the Date the Bills are Mailed	Total Average Days' interval between Number of Days from Date Services are Fumished to Date Collections are Received	Notes private fire Quarterly is billed in advance Alf monthly customers are billed in arrears
	Revenues less private fire Private Fire billed in advance Total	Average Med	Number of Da the Date the E Number of Da the Date the E	Total Average Days from Da Date Collection	Notes private

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company Tennessee American Water Docket No

End of Month	Amount	440.599	494,423	469,586	389,330	339,416	389,297	405,581	412,027	361,829	358,597	368,397	362,666	364,209	5,155,957	396,612
Endo	<u>Oate</u>	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	0લ-01	Nov-01	Dec-01	Jan-02	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02	Jul-02	Total	Average Balance

Tennessee Public Service Commission Company Tennessee-American Water Company Docket No

Aonth	Amount	49,999	51,015	80,838	52,586	18,040	38,256	66,200	42,800	72,819	37,813	44,500	41,302	54,837	651,005	50,077	
End of Month	Date	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01	Jan-02	Feb-02	Mar-02	Apr-02	May-02	Jun-02	Jul-02	Total	Average Balance	

Line Locket No Locket No Description 1 Operating Revenues 2 Operating Revenues 3 Operation and Maintenance Expenses 4 Depreciation and Amortization 5 Taxes, Other than Income 6 Income Taxes 7 Total Operating Expenses 9 Utility Operating Expenses 12 Other Income 13 AFUDC 14 Income from M & Jand Contract Work 15 Interest Income 16 Gain/Loss on Sale of Property 17 Total Other Income 18 Total Other Deductions 20 Other Deductions 21 Miscellaneous Amortization 22 Miscellaneous Other Deductions 23 Taxes Analizable Other Income 24 Total Other Deductions	Taxes Applicable to Other Income and Deductions Ceneral Taxes State Income Taxes State Income Taxes Total Taxes Applicable to Other Income and Deductions Comments of the Comment of Comment of the Comment of Co
Docket No or pany year or pany	

Statement of Income Per Books for the Test Year and for the Attrition Year under both Present and Proposed Rates

Test Year Tweive Months Ended March 31, 2004
Exhibit No 2, Schedule 1
Page 1 of 1

Attntion Year at Proposed	\$35,028,304	16 608 636	4 558 016	3,510,468	3,212,728	27,979,847	7,048,457	0	0 (5 C	5	0	,	0	0	0	c	0 0	00	0		7,048,457		606,000,2	0 0	112 143		0	2,793,052	4,255,405
Adjustments for Proposed <u>Rates</u>	\$1,970,887	18 069	000,5	53.491	697,297	768,856	1,202,031	0	0 1	0 0	0	0		0	0	0	Ć	0 (00			1,202,031	c	> 0	0 0	- c		0	0	1,202,031
Attrition Year at Present Rales	\$33,057,417	16 GRO 568	4.558.016	3,456,977	2,515,431	27,210,991	5,846,426	0	0 (0 0	D	0	,	0	0	0	c	0	00			5,846,426	000	7,000,000	> 0	112 143	,	0	2,793,052	3,053,374
Attriion Year <u>Adjustments</u>	\$204,835	(445 330)	386,308	88,103	(239,633)	(210,553)	415,388	0	0 (> c	•	0	•	0	0	0	c		00	0		415,388	c	, c	> 0	0 6		0	0	415,388
Normalized <u>Test Year</u>	\$32,852,582	17.125.898	4.171.708	3,368,874	2,755,064	27,421,544	5,431,038	0	0 0	0 0	Þ	0	ć	0	0	0	c			0		5,431,038	0000	500.	0 0	112 143	0	0	2,793,052	2,637,986
Test Year Adjustments Present Rates	\$1,962,223	1,681,869	(78,174)	(287,776)	476,570	1,792,489	169,734	(147,213)	24,247	(150,001)	•	(222,997)	ć	0	(56,247)	(56,247)	c		0 0	0		2,984	755 703	(142.283)	(19 525)	(135.912)	0	83,895	541,968	(538,984)
Per Books 12 Months Ended 3/3/1/2004	\$30,890,359	15,444,029	4,249,882	3,656,650	2,278,494	25,629,055	5,261,304	517,741	(24.247)	50,52	•	222,997	ć	9 !	56,247	56,247	c	· c	00	0		5,428,054	1 925 116	142 283	19.525	248,055	0	(83,895)	2,251,084	3,176,970
Adjustment Shown on Schedule No	7	ю	4	v o	9		'				1	1									1	i							1	1 11

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company Tennessee-Amencan Water Company Docket No

Sales of Water Sale	3/31/2004 PP 512,048,536 9,345,680 3,227,598 2,381,918 882,779 1,183,197 642,114 629,711,822	\$1,234,572 38,092 171,772 89,780 37,935 101,914 253,671
Sales of Water Metered Sales to General Customers Residential Commercial Industrial Other Public Authorities Sales for Resale Private Fire Service Total Sales of Water Total Sales of Water Colher Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penality Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	,048,536 ,345,680 ,227,598 ,381,918 ,183,197 ,111,822	\$1,234,57 38,09 171,77 89,78 37,93 253,67
Residential Commercial Industrial Sales for Resale Private Fire Service Total Sales of Water Total Sales of Water Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues Sewer Billing Revenues	.048,536 ,345,680 (227,598 .381,918 882,779 642,114 (711,822	\$1,234,57 38,09 171,77 89,78 37,93 253,67 253,67
Residential Commercial Industrial 3 Other Public Authorities Sales for Resale Private Fire Service Total Sales of Water Total Sales of Water Cother Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	,048,536 ,345,680 ,227,598 ,381,918 ,183,197 ,111,822	\$1,234,57 38,09 171,77 89,78 37,93 101,91 253,67
Commercial Industrial 3 Other Public Authorities Sales for Resale Private Fire Service Total Sales of Water Total Sales of Water Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	(227,598 (327,598 (381,918 (382,779 (111,822) (711,822)	38,092 171,772 89,780 37,935 101,914 253,671
Industrial Cther Public Authorities Sales for Resale Private Fire Service Total Sales of Water Total Sales of Water Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	.381,918 882,779 882,779 642,114 .711,822	77,171 89,78 37,93 110,101 253,67
Cither Public Authorities Sales for Resale Private Fire Service Public Fire Service Total Sales of Water Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penality Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	,381,918 882,779 ,183,197 ,511,822	89,783 37,93; 101,91; 253,67
Sales for Resale Private Fire Service Dublic Fire Service Total Sales of Water Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	882,779 .183,197 642,114 .711,822	37,93; 101,101 253,67 73,73;
Private Fire Service Public Fire Service Total Sales of Water Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	.183,197 642,114 .711,822 103,523	253,67 1,927,739
Public Fire Service Total Sales of Water Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	642,114 ,711,822 103,523	253,67 1,927,73
Total Sales of Water Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	711,822	1,927,73
Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	,711,822 103,523	1,927,73
Other Operating Revenues Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	103,523	
Activity / New Service Fees Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	103,523	
Late Payment Penalty Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues		0
Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	770 007	
Rents from Water Property Sewer Billing Revenues	430,944	37,37,5
Sewer Billing Revenues	102,336	0
	361,987	2,115
Miscellaneous	25,630	0
Reconnection Fee	86,117	0
Total Other Operating Revenues 1,17	1,178,537	34,487
Total Operating Revenues 30,89	30,890,359	1,962,223

Operating Revenues Per Books for the Test Year and for the Attrition Year under both Present and Proposed Rates

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2004
Exhibit No. 2, Schedule 2
Page 1 of 1

Attrition Year at Proposed <u>Rates</u>	\$14,523,596	10,331,999	3,709,977	2,729,680	1,004,862	1,478,415	0	33,778,529	103,523	567,235	102,336	364,934	25,630	86,117	1,249,775	35,028,304
Adjustments for Proposed <u>Rates</u>	\$1,220,903	867,029	310,607	228,910	84,148	124,025	(897,285)	1,938,337	0	32,550	0	0	0	0	32,550	1,970,887
Attriton Year at Present Rates	\$13,302,693	9,464,970	3,399,370	2,500,770	920,714	1,354,390	897,285	31,840,192	103,523	534,685	102,336	364,934	25,630	86,117	1,217,225	33,057,417
Attriion Year <u>Adjustmenis</u>	\$19,585	81,198	0	29,072	0	69,279	1,500	200,634	0	3,369	0	832	0	0	4,201	204,835
Nomalized <u>Test Year</u>	\$13,283,108	9,383,772	3,399,370	2,471,698	920,714	1,285,111	895,785	31,639,558	103,523	531,316	102,336	364,102	25,630	86,117	1,213,024	32,852,582
Test Year Adjustments <u>Present Rates</u>	\$1,234,572	38,092	171,772	89,780	37,935	101,914	253,671	1,927,736	0	32,372	0	2,115	0	0	34,487	1,962,223
Per Books 12 Months Ended 3/31/2004	\$12,048,536	9,345,680	3,227,598	2,381,918	882,779	1,183,197	642,114	29,711,822	103,523	498,944	102,336	361,987	25,630	86,117	1,178,537	30,890,359

Tennessee Regulatory Authority
Company Tennessee-American Water Company
Docket No

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2004
Exhibit No 2, Schedule 3
Page 1 of 1

			Per Books						
Line	Adjustment Number Reference	Description	12 Months Ended 3/31/2004	Test Year Adjustments Present Rates	Normalized Test Year	Attration Year Adjustments	Attrition Year at Present Rates	Adjustments for Proposed Rates	Attrition Year at Proposed Rales
0	-	Operation and Maintenance Labor	\$4,631,351	\$805,084	\$5,436,435	(\$1,052,551)	\$4,383,883	\$0	\$4,383,883
10 4	2	Purchased Water	\$15,330	0	15,330	0	15,330	0	15,330
· so se	е	Fuel and Power	\$1,520,849	231,077	1,751,926	3,754	1,755,680	0	1,755,680
) ~ e	4	Chemicals	\$723,833	135,575	859,408	2,452	861,861	0	861,861
9 0	S	Waste Disposal	\$129,719	3,256	132,975	463	133,438	0	133,438
: = 2	9	Management Fees	\$2,492,981	0	2,492,981	656'695	3,062,940	0	3,062,940
13 4	7	Group Insurance	\$1,345,749	198,767	1,544,516	(158,512)	1,386,004	0	1,386,004
51 41	89	Pensions	\$516,005	384,607	900,612	(7,822)	892,790	0	892,790
. t =	o	Regulatory Expense	\$113,844	(113,844)	0	58,000	58,000	0	58,000
5 E C	10	Insurance Other than Group	\$670,413	(85,413)	585,000	72,000	657,000	0	657,000
21 22	Ξ	Customer Accounting	\$559,654	3,849	563,503	6,390	572,893	0	572,893
23 3	12	Uncollectible Expense	\$269,736	17,928	287,664	1,866	289,530	18,068	307,598
25	13	Rents	\$38,286	٥	38,286	0	38,286	0	38,286
27	14	General Office Expense	\$189,347	(2,394)	186,953	6,169	193,122	0	193,122
2 2 2	51	Miscellaneous Expense	\$1,596,601	39,718	1,636,319	25,651	1,661,970	0	1,661,970
31.	91	Other Maintenance Expense	\$630,331	92,450	722,781	23,851	746,632	0	746,632
33	17	Interest on Customer Deposits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
38 38	18	AFUDC		(28,791)	(28,791)	0	(28,791)	0	(28,791)

16,698,636

18,068

16,680,568

(445,330)

17,125,898

15,444,029- 1,681,869

Total Operation and Maintenance Expenses

37 38 39 40 41 42 43

Summary of Adjustments to Depreciation and Amortization Expenses

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company Tennessee-American Water Company Docket No

Regulatory Authority Tennessee-American	Regulatory Authority Tennessee-American Water Company					Test Year Tweive Months Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No 2, Schedule 4 Pege 1 of 2	e Months Ended Exhibit N	hs Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No 2, Schedule 4 Page 1 of 2
Adjustment Number <u>Reference</u>	Description	Per Books 12 Months Ended 3/31/2004	Test Year Adjustments Present Rates	Normalized Test Year	Altnion Year <u>Adjustments</u>	Attnion Year at Present Rates	Adjustments for Proposed Rates	Attrition Year at Proposed Rates
-	Depreciation Expense	\$4,129,281	(\$78,174)	\$4,051,107	\$386,308	\$4,437,415	9	\$4,437,415
5	Amortization of Utility Plant Acquistion Adjustment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	Amortization of Utility Capital Lease	\$120,601	0	120,601	0	120,601	0	120,601
4	Amortization of Leased Alteration Expense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	Amortization of Accumulated Depreciation on CIAC	0		0	0	0	0	0

4 558,016

386,308

4,171,708

(78.174)

4,249,882

Attrition Year Provision for Depreciation Expense For Utility Plant in Service

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2004 Exhibit No 2, Schedule 4 Page 2 of 2

uthority

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company Tennessee-American Water Company Docket No

:	Attnton Year Depreciation	Expense	\$81,026	73,236	77,972	170,079	6.031	21,910	21,609	695'6	7,644	98,198	2,350	203	523,510	R61'69	113,748	3,076	i i	68,140	61,505	Ξ	664,011	51,681	281,345	,	347,867	41,499	13,004	1 248	108,386	139,193	505	14,169	139,539	246,684	21,816	26.417	14.245	10,761	102,413	69,654	15,694	248	2,161	36,278	39,056	27.72	21,234	7,457	(114,521)	4 427 415	4,437,415
	Depreciation	Rale	20 00%	3 86%	4 57%	10 00%	7480 6	4 65%	5 64%	3 40%	3 44%	1 73%	1 97%	3 94%	4 27%	36 42%	#08 L	200 t		1 41%	1 62%	1 36%	1 36%	1 42%	1 42%		2 28%	%86 D	15 35%	%86 O	1 64%	2 21%	5 92%	2 73%	15 90%	15 90%	15 90%	2004	15 90%	4 07%	. %98 6	%66 6	10 54%	%02 0	4 98%	3 85%	11 12%	\$17.6 702.8	45.45 A	2 89%		,	y
Deprecable	Property at Mid-Point of	Attrition Year	\$405,132	1,897,305	1,706,175	1,700,789	151 528	471,183	383,138	281,452	222,196	5,676,202	119,296	5,145	12,260,179	190,000	551 048	170,895		4,832,607	3,796,632	826	48,824,310	3,639,488	19,813,012		15 257,306	4,234,530	938,517	127 387	6.608.879	6,298,341	8,526	519,029	877,602	1,551,473	137,208	3,783,504	89 590	264.396	1,094,156	697,241	148,897	35,388	43,392	942,296	351,219	229,342	321,290	258,043	:	150 000 031	617'808'RCL
		RETIREMENTS	0	0	0 (0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0 (0	o c	•	75.400	0	0	0	12,758	0	•	0 (0 0		59 339	0	61,000	0	0	0	30,000	0 (0 0	0 0	0	33,500	0	0	0	0	0	0 (0 0		0		271.007	271,997
		ADDITIONS	0	0	0 1	0 0	0 0	151.450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	190,000	000,086,1	•	•	2.916.187	0	0	0	564,972	0		438,083	1,802,851	710,800	2000	0	329,370	0	0	735,000	447,573	0 1	0 0	0 0	127.200	0	0	0	0	0	187,445	0	0 0	0 0	0	1	00000	10,094,648
Normalized	Test Year Depreciation	Expense	\$81,026	73,236	77,972	1/0,0/9	17.042	14.868	21,609	699'6	7,644	98,198	2,350	203	523,510	0	87,128	30,00		28.085	61,505	=	664,011	43,839	281,345		337,878	23,831	200	1,004	108.386	133,262	505	14,169	22,674	180,290	21,816	567,093	14 245	5.584	105,549	69,654	15,694	248	2,161	29,062	39,056	21,122	14,234	7.457	(108,317)		4 051,107
	Depreciable Property at	3/31/2004	\$405,132	1,897,305	1,706,175	1,700,789	151 528	319,733	383,138	281,452	222,196	5,676,202	119,296	5,145	12,260,179	0	4,840,436	170.895	680.784	1,991,820	3,796,632	826	48,824,310	3,087,274	19,813,012	102,029	14,819,223	2,431,779	04 620	130,726	6 608 879	6,029,971	8,526	519,029	142,602	1,133,900	137,208	3,783,604	89 590	137 196	1,127,656	697,241	148,897	35,388	43,392	754,851	351,219	229,342	321,298	258.043	1		149,829,441
	Account	Description	Comprehensive Planning Study	Pumping Structures	Water Treatment Structures	Water Treatment Structures-Painting		Stores Shop, & Garage Structures	Miscellaneous Structures	Lakes, Rivers, & Other Intakes	Power Generation Equipment	Electric Pumping Equipment	Deisel Pumping Equipment	Other Pumping Equipment	Water Treatment Equipment	Granular Activated Carbon	T & D Despress & Standpipes	Flowered Tanks & Standanos	330400 Clearwell	T & D Mains not Classified	T & D Mains - Mains (4" or less)	T & D Mains - Mains (6" - 8")	T & D Mains - Mains (6" - 10")	T & D Mains - Mains (10" - 16")	T & D Mains - Mains (12" or More)		Services	Meters	Meters-Metal Case/Old Style		Meter Installations	Hydrants	Other P/E SS	Office Furniture	Computer & Perpheral Equipment	Computer & Penph Personal	Computer & Penph Other	Computer Software	Computer Software Other	Other Office Faunmen	Light Trucks	Heavy Trucks	Automobiles	Transportation-Other	Stores Equipment	Tools, Shop, & Garage Equipment		Power Operated Equipment	Communication Equipment	Communication Equipment : Leighnone Miscellaneous Equipment	Amortization of CIAC		Total Plant in Service
	Account	Number	303 99	304 22	304 31	304 32	304 40	304 52	304 53	306 20	310 20	311 22	31123	311 27	320 31	320 33	330 41	330 43		331 40	331 41	331 44	331 42	331 45	331 43	;	333 40	334 41	336 42	334 44	334 45	335 40	339 00	340 51	340 53	340 56	340 57	340 55	340 59	340 54	341 52	341 53	2 2	341 55	342 50	343 50	344 50	345.50	346 51	347 51	Š		
	911	2	-	5	ღ,	4 4		· ~	80	6	0	=	12	₽	4 ;	0 9	5 5	ā	2	19	20	21	22	23	24	;	25	5 26	7 00	0 0	2 8	3.5	32	33	8	35	ب ب	3.5	9 6	5 6	41	42	43	44	45	16	47	8 4	20 0	5 5	52	53	2

Summary of Adjustments to Taxes Other than Income Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company Tennessee-American Water Company Docket No

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2004
Exhibit No 2, Schedule 5
Page 1 of 1

Attntron Year at Proposed <u>Rates</u>	\$2,503,629	669,035	4,577	332,999	228	3,510,468	
Adjustments for Proposed <u>Rates</u>	\$	53,491	0	0	0	53,491	
Attntion Year at Present <u>Rates</u>	\$2,503,629	615,544	4,577	332,999	228	3,456,977	
Attrition Year Adjustments	\$199,465	(42,030)	(1,550)	(67,703)	(62)	88,103	
Normalized <u>Test Year</u>	\$2,304,164	657,574	6,127	400,702	307	3,368,874	
Test Year Adjustments <u>Present Rates</u>	(\$320,865)	o	1,093	36,777	(4,781)	(287,776)	
Per Books 12 Months Ended 3/31/2004	\$2,625,029	657,574	5,034	363,925	5,088	3,656,650	
Description	Property Taxes	Other General Taxes	FUTA Taxes	FICA Taxes	SUTATaxes	Total	
Adjustment Number Reference	-	2	8	4	ĸ		•
No 1	3 5) -4 rC	9 ~	ထော	5 =	12	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4

Federal Income Tax - Current

Description

Deferred Federal Income Tax State Income Tax - Current

Deferred State Income Tax

Amortization of ITC

	_
	_
٠.	

_			8 0	100	Exhibit No	Exhibit No 2 dule 6 Exhibit No 2 dule 6 1 of 2
Per Books 12 Months Ended 3/31/2004	Test Year Adjustments Present Rates	Nomalized Test Year	0 Attnton Year <u>Adjustments</u>	Attrition' Year al Present Rales	Adjustments for Proposed Rates	Atmon Year at Proposed Rates
\$86,904	\$462 953	\$549 857	(\$201,627)	\$348,230	\$535,526	\$883,756
88,501	13,617	102,118	(36,771)	65,347	161,771	227,118
1,484,214		1,484 214	380 850	1 865 064	0	1,865,064
313,158	0	313,158	0	313,158	0	313,158
(76.368)	0	(76 368)	0	(76,368)	0	(76,368)
0	0	0	0	0	0	J
0	0	0	0	0	0	J

Adjustment of Pnor Years - SIT Adjustment of Pnor Years - FIT

gulatory Authority Incesse American Water Company

<u>\$</u> 2

Test Year Twelve Months Ended March 31 2004 Estubit No 2, Schedule 6 Page 2 of 2

अब केर्ने व्यवस्थान के बाह्य है	Per Br 15 44 0 4 24 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	40 4 20 4 20 4 20 4 20 4 20 4 20 4 20 4	Normalidad Vear Present Rates Sign S	2.2.5.5.2.5.2.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5	Existent Research Res	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Endergy SS 72	200 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	
10.10.1	(42 044 983) (1 044 983) (1 044 983) (1 044 983) 14 09 784 21 820 (3 394 498)	(142 633) (144 693) (164 693) (169 312) (189 312) (14 243 (19 784 21 820 (13 394 486)	(927-839) (1 042-833) (1 042-833) (1 083-312) (1 083-312) (1 083-312) (2 3 3 044-98)	(37.2 639) (164.983) (164.983) (169.312) (14.243 169,784 21.820 (3.394.489)	(152,000) (1542,639) (1042,433) (169,314) (169,784) (4,482,640)	(4,482 640)	(197.00) (194.263) (104.263) (189.372) (189.372) (19.764) (4.412.640)	(104.839) (104.839) (104.833) (189.312) (189.312) 21.820 (4.482.640)	
Federal Tursbak Income Before SIT Preferred Dividend Credit State Income Tax Issable Income Computation of Taxes State income Tax State income Tax State income Tax Total Current Income Tax Deferred SIT Deferred SIT Including ITC	2 101 507 178 090 1,975 417 (76 269) 615 028 623 062	2 101 507 2 101 507 126 080 176 080	1701 863 (28 824) 102 118 1,57,021 548 857 (16 569) 473 469	1701963	1,009,115 (78 624) 65 347 694 694 346 230 (75 306) 27,1,662	1,089,115	2.780 006 (28 824) 227 037 2,524,145 (76,269) 607 083 617 083 1 529 201	3,783,955 3,783,955 227 037 0 0 0 227,037	

Rate of Return Summary At the Mid-Point of the Attrition Year

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company: Tennessee American Water Docket No: 04-

Test Year: Twelve Months Ended: March 31, 2004

Exhibit No. 3, Schedule 1

Page 1 of 1

			10 70%	Return Proposed	Total Common Equity Return Proposed	
7.997%	1 11	100 01%	88,061,424		Total Capitalization	
2 252% 2 477%	10 70% 10 70%	21.05% 23.15%	18,537,633 20,384,057		Common Equity Common Stock Retained Earnings	
%080 0	2 00%	1 59%	1,400,000	Schedule 3	Preferred Equity	
0.128%	2 40%	5 34%	4,699,624		Short-term Debt	
3.060%	6 26%	48.88%	\$43,040,110	Schedule 2	Long-term Debt	
Weighted Cost of <u>Capital</u>	Cost Rate	Percent of <u>Total</u>	Amount	Reference	Class of Capital	

6 26%

\$2,696,206

429,934 355,374 902,500 216,320 110,146

449,158

232,774

Total Cost

At the Mid-Point of the Attrition Year **Embedded Cost of Long-Term Debt**

Exhibit No. 3, Schedule 2

Test Year: Twelve Months Ended: March 31, 2004

Page 1 of 1

Company: Tennessee American Water Docket No: 04-Tennessee Regulatory Authority

Annual Amortization of Issue Expense		1,524	0 0	2.278	7,434	5,004	0		0			\$16.240				ll .								
Annual Interest Expense		231,250	00	446,880	422,500	350,370	902,500	216,320	110,146	•		\$2 679 966												
Carrying <u>Value</u>		2,478,011	00	5,651,792	6,478,311	5,071,221	19,000,000	3,200,000	1,160,775			\$43 040 110												
Unamortized (Issuance) Debt Exp		21,989	00	48,208	21,689	28,779	0	0				\$120,665	Н											
Face Amount Outstanding		2,500,000	00	5,700,000	6,500,000	5,100,000	19,000,000	3,200,000	1,160,775			\$43,160,775												
Principal <u>Amount</u>		2,500,000	0 0	5,700,000	6,500,000	5,100,000	19,000,000	3,200,000	1,590,500			\$43,590,500	H											
Maturity <u>Date</u>		12/01/19	06/01/05	08/03/26	06/01/08	03/29/11	03/01/14	06/01/34	05/31/13			•	"											
Issue <u>Date</u>		01/12/90	06/25/92	09/04/96	05/31/98	03/31/01	03/01/04	06/01/04	06/01/98															
Interest <u>Rate</u>		9 25%	8 25% 6 77%	7 84%	6 50%	6 87%	4 7 5%	%92 9	9 489%															
Debt Issue Type, <u>Coupon Rate</u>	General Mortgage Bonds	9 25% Series	6 77% Series	7 84% Series	6 50% Series	6 87% Series	4 25% Series	6 76% Series (proposed)	Capital Lease 9 489%			Total			Embedded Cost of Long-Term Debt									
LING NO 2 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4		<u>- ۵</u>	o თ 	10	=	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	53	?

Embedded Cost of Preferred Stock At the Mid-Point of the Attrition Year

Tennessee Regulatory Authority Company: Tennessee American Water Docket No: 04-

Test Year: Twelve Months Ended: March 31, 2004

Exhibit No. 3, Schedule 3 Page 1 of 1

Total Annual <u>Cost</u>	\$70,000	70,000	2 00%
Annual Amort of Issuance <u>Expense</u>	0 \$	0	
Annual Dividends	\$70,000	70,000	
Jnamortized (Issuance) Pfd Stk Exp Net Proceeds	\$0 \$1,400,000 0 0	1,400,000	
Unamortized (Issuance) Pfd Stk Exp	0	0	
Premium or <u>Discount</u>	0\$	0	
Face Amount Premium or Outstanding <u>Discount</u>	\$1,400,000	1,400,000	
Issue <u>Date</u>	12/20/40 \$1 7/29/54	, "	red Stock
Debt Issue Type, <u>Coupon Rate</u>	Cumulative Preferred 5% Series 4-1/2% Series	Total	Embedded Cost of Preferred Stock
No 1 Vo) 4 \(\text{0} \(\nabla \)	დ ი Ç	1 2 3