STATE OF TENNESSEE

Office of the Attorney General



ROBERT E. COOPER, JR. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND REPORTER

CORDELL HULL AND JOHN SEVIER STATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

MICHAEL E. MOORE SOLICITOR GENERAL

TELEPHONE (615) 741-3491 FACS!MILE (615) 741-2009

CHIEF DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL

LAWRENCE HARRINGTON

CHIEF POLICY DEPUTY

LUCY HONEY HAYNES

MAILING ADDRESS
P.O. BOX 20207
NASHVILLE, TN 37202

September 21, 2009

Paul Greene Utilities Division Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0505

filed electronically in docket office on 09/21/09

Re:

Docket No. 09-00056 - Petition of Cartwright Creek, LLC to Change and Increase Rates

and Charges.

Dear Mr. Greene:

Pursuant to the data request issued at the September 9, 2009 Status Conference in the above-referenced docket, enclosed please find four copies plus an electronic version of the following documents provided by Dave Peters of the Consumer Advocate and Protection Division:

- 1. A response to the inquiry on whether the revenues shown on CAPD Schedule 2 were current rates and forecasted customers and volumes or proposed rates and forecasted customers and volumes.
- 2. A Price out showing how the revenues on CAPD Schedule 2 were calculated.

If you have any questions regarding this response to the data request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (615) 741-4657.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mary Leigh White

Assistant Attorney General

Attachments

Cc: Thomas L. Kolschowsky

Henry Walker

Q. Are the revenues shown on CAPD Schedule 2 current rates and forecasted customers and volumes or proposed rates and forecasted customers and volumes?

1 2

3

6 7

8

9

10 11

3334353637

- 4 A. The revenues shown on Schedule 2 are proposed rates. There are no forecasted customers or volumes on this schedule.
 - Q. Provide a price out showing how the revenues on CAPD Schedule 2 were calculated. Your response should provide residential customer counts by bedroom and commercial customers by volume.
- A. The company revenues were taken from the company supplied P&L. They show 12 13 attrition year revenues of \$438,369 and if you add cells F10 and 11 on CAPD Schedule 2, the result is \$435,969. The difference of \$2,400 is the bonding fee surcharge which is 14 incorrectly removed in cell F11. The correct company proposed revenue should be 15 \$438,969 which represents the actual 2008 residential (less an unexplained \$800 16 adjustment - net is \$189,641) and commercial revenues (\$54,137) multiplied by their 17 18 proposed 75% rate increase plus the bonding fee surcharge of \$2,400, the \$8,000 from other system revenues and the other sewer revenues of \$1,359. On the CAPD side for 19 20 proposed revenues, the main difference was using a multiplier of 27.75 (on the residential revenues CAPD did not adjust for the unknown \$800 adjustment and used 21 \$190,441 instead of \$189,641 and 27.75% instead of 75%). There were two components 22 of revenue that the company did not apply the rate hike to (Bonding Fee surcharge and 23 Other revenues) so the CAPD has followed the same rationale. Because of the two 24 components that there was no rate hike applied to, the effective rate hike was 26.47% 25 26 (see Sch. 1 in workpapers). On the expense side, the CAPD has removed the amortization expense of \$8,333 in Sch. 2 because we feel that this expense is related to 27 the Waterbridge development and is not pertinent to this docket. CAPD was not 28 29 provided with data including the Company's commercial customers by volume, and as 30 a result, will be unable to provide the requested commercial price out to the TRA Staff. Please see attached corrected Schedule 2 and Price out showing the revenues calculation 31 32 as well as breakdown of revenues by customer class.

Cartwright Creek L.L.C. TRA Docket #09-00056 Comparison of Rate Making Components Company vs. Consumer Advocate For 12 Months Ending December 31, 2009

Line # 1 2 3 4	Residential revenues Bonding Fee Surcharge Commercial revenues Other Revenues	Company 2009 Proposed \$189,641 \$2,400 \$54,137 \$9,359	B/ C/	\$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0	Consumer Advocate Proposed > \$242,266 \$2,400 \$69,160 \$9,359	(\$67,648) 16659 (\$6,371) 316812.8751 (\$67,648)
5	Total Revenues	\$255,536		\$0	\$323,184	26.47%
		> \$180,433				\$0
6	Sludge removal expense	\$68,463		\$0	\$68,463	(\$2,400)
7	Purchased power	\$29,929		\$3,722 F/	\$26,208	
8	Chemicals	\$10,354		\$0	\$10,354	\$11,759
9	Materials & supplies	\$10,161	H/	\$1,000	\$9,161	\$55,889
10	Plant Management	\$143,048		\$67,906	\$75,142	47.47%
11	Accounting	\$30,400		\$0	\$30,400	\$36,656
12	Repairs & Maint to plant	\$31,191		\$0	\$31,191	
13	Rents	\$7,800		\$7,800	\$0	
14	Transportation expenses	\$4,936		\$0	\$4,936	
15	Telephone	\$1,535		\$0	\$1,535	
16	Insurance expenses	\$19,805	O/	\$10,237	\$9,567	
17	Postage	\$2,260		\$216	\$2,044	
18	Rate Case Expense	\$8,000	Q/	\$0	\$8,000	
19	Regulatory commission expense	\$707	R/	\$0	\$707	
20	Bad debt expense	\$500		\$0	\$500	
21	Interest Exp - Smith Note	\$15,338	THE PERSON NAMED IN	\$0	\$15,338	
22	Bank charges	\$3,811		\$0	\$3,811	
23	Miscellaneous expense	\$2,637		\$0	\$2,637	
24	Industry association dues	\$520		\$0	\$520	
25	Depreciation	\$27,645		\$27,645	\$0	
26	Amortization exp - other	\$8,333		\$0	\$0	
27	Permits & Taxes other than income	\$17,000		\$0	\$17,000	
28	Interest & dividend income	(\$7,200)		\$0	(\$7,200)	
29	Total Expenses	\$ 429,035	-	\$ 118,526	\$ 302,177	
30	Net Operating Income (Before Taxes)	\$ 6,934		\$ (118,526)	\$ 21,007	6.50%
		\$420,897.63	-	\$118,525.53	\$294,039.10	\$29,144.92

	Company		
<u>Bedrooms</u>	<u>Current</u>	Proposed	% Change
1	\$20.74	\$37.02	78.50%
2	\$26.10	\$46.67	78.81%
3	\$30.38	\$54.37	78.97%
4	\$35.21	\$63.07	79.13%
5	\$39.49	\$70.77	79.21%
Commercial	\$132.69	\$232.20	75.00%

Source: Company's Current Rates for Residential Customers and their proposed rates in tariff plus a Calculation of Commercial Rates - This number was derived from taking the commercial revenues that the company supplied and dividing it by the number of customers provided by the company - all divided by 12 to get a monthly rate

CAPD							
Bedrooms	Current	Proposed	% Change				
1	\$20.74	\$26.50	27.75%				
2	\$26.10	\$33.34	27.75%				
3	\$30.38	\$38.81	27.75%				
4	\$35.21	\$44.98	27.75%				
5 .	\$39.49	\$50.45	27.75%				
Commercial	\$132.69	\$169.51	27.75%				

Source: Company's Current Rates for Residential Customers Plus a Calculation of Commercial Rates - This number was derived from taking the commercial revenues that the company supplied and dividing it by the number of customers provided by the company - all divided by 12 to get a monthly rate

IN THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE: PETITION OF CARTWRIGHT CREEK, L.L.C. TO CHANGE AND INCREASE RATES AND CHARGES)) DOCKET NO. 09-00056))			
AFFIDAVIT OF	DAVE PETERS			
I, Dave Peters, Regulatory Analyst, for the General's Office, hereby certify that the attached	ne Consumer Advocate Division of the Attorney I responses represent my opinion in the above-			
referenced case and the opinion of the Consumer Advocate Division.				
	Ja H			
	DAVE PETERS			
Sworn to and subscribed before me this //dd day of Sept., 2009. NOTARY PUBLIC My commission expires: (112, 23, 2011)	STATE OF TENNESSEE NOTARY PUBLIC SON COUNTAIN A Commission Expires AUG. 23, 2011			