

**Tiffany Underwood**

---

**From:** Tiffany Underwood  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 07, 2015 3:22 PM  
**To:** 'Linda.Bridwell@amwater.com'  
**Cc:** David Foster; Michelle Ramsey  
**Subject:** Staff Data Request No. 3  
**Attachments:** Chemical Expenses (MR) 15-00001.xlsx; 15-00001 TRA Third Data Request to TAWC .docx

Linda,

Please see attached the TRA's third data request. Please provide responses as soon as possible.

Thanks,

*Tiffany Underwood  
Utilities Consultant  
Tennessee Regulatory Authority  
(615)770-6893*

TRA THIRD DATA REQUEST

DOCKET NO. 15-00001

July 7, 2015

1. Please explain the rationale for the Company adding sales tax to Chemical Costs purchased from ADC even though sales tax was not included on the invoice.
2. Staff notes that chemical costs from ADC invoices were not included in chemical inventory but were directly included in PCOP costs. Staff also opines that the Company made errors when it totaled up each individual expense. Please verify the following discrepancies and provide a response as to whether the Company agrees.

	Staff	TAWC
Fluosilicic Acid(1200648)	3,421.55	3,590.97
Sodium Hypochlorite(1200942)	16,762.50	16,822.51
Sodium Hydroxide(1201423)	31,777.57	30,584.63
Phosphate, Ortho-Poly Carus (121451)	14,497.25	14,634.42
Polymer(1201701)	1,140.00	2,900.02
	<u>67,598.87</u>	<u>68,532.55</u>

3. It appears the Company changed its methodology for Chemical cost calculation for Suck Creek. Staff recalculated Chemical costs for Suck Creek using same methodology from Docket No. 13-00130. Please verify the following discrepancies and provide a response as to whether the Company agrees.

	TAWC	Staff
Month	Suck Creek	Suck Creek
Dec-13	\$ -	
Jan-14	-	479.03
Feb-14	32.88	
Mar-14	233.90	
Apr-14	74.53	349.76
May-14	211.64	
Jun-14	92.20	317.96
Jul-14	43.31	
Aug-14	302.73	
Sep-14	-	668.07
Oct-14	337.97	
Nov-14	144.84	
Total	<u>\$ 1,474.00</u>	<u>\$ 1,814.82</u>

TRA THIRD DATA REQUEST

DOCKET NO. 15-00001

July 7, 2015

4. Staff notes the Company included different amounts of chemical costs in its PCOP calculation than the invoiced amount on Chemical Bill Nos. 113, 114, 115 and 116. Please explain why these amounts are different.

## **Tiffany Underwood**

---

**From:** Tiffany Underwood  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 08, 2015 10:37 AM  
**To:** 'Linda.Bridwell@amwater.com'  
**Cc:** David Foster; Michelle Ramsey  
**Subject:** TRA's fourth data request Docket No. 15-00001  
**Attachments:** 15-00001 TRA Fourth Data Request to TAWC .docx; Purchase Water year end 11-30-14(Staff).xlsx; Purchased Power year end 11-30-14(Staff).xlsx

Linda,

Please see attached. The TRA's fourth data request for Docket No. 15-00001.

*Tiffany Underwood  
Utilities Consultant  
Tennessee Regulatory Authority  
(615)770-6893*

Fuel & Power

1. The Company appears to have included a late fee of \$6.79 for EPB Bill No. 511. Does the Company agree that the proper amount for this bill should be reduced for the late fee from \$145.91 to \$139.12 resulting in total EPB power expense of \$2,552,685.73?
2. For Sequachee Valley expense, it appears that the Company included some prior balance amounts and was inconsistent with the treatment of operational round up charges. Staff recalculated Sequachee Valley to remove the prior balances and include the operational round up charges to arrive at \$85,546.73 resulting in a reduction of \$293.01 in power expense from Sequachee Valley. Does the Company agree with Staff's recalculation?

Purchased Water

3. Please reconcile the total Purchased Water amounts on the schedule totaling \$43,443.60 with the \$43,464.67 amount included on the Petitioner's Exhibit, Support Workpaper, Page 2 of 3. This appears to be a formula error in Cell C17 of the "Monthly Totals" tab of "TN Pruchased Water 2014 Workpaper."
4. The Company appears to have included prior balances for Hixon Utility District Bill Nos. 24 and 25. Does the Company agree that these amounts should be removed resulting in an increase of Purchase Water Expense from Hixon Utility District of \$48.93?
5. The Company appears to have made an adjustment to increase Walden's Ridge Utility District Bill No. 32 by \$50.00. Should the expense amount be \$3,122.12, instead of \$3,172.12? If the adjustment is proper, please provide support and an explanation for the adjustment.