filed electronically in docket office on 11/07/17

IN THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE:)	
)	
PETITION OF INTEGRA WATER)	
TENNESSEE, LLC FOR A)	DOCKET NO. 17-00014
CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC)	
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY AND)	
AUTHORITY TO CHARGE RATES IN)	
CASEY COVE SUBDIVISION LOCATED)	
IN DEKALB COUNTY, TENNESSEE)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY

of

David N. Dittemore

ON BEHALF OF
THE CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ADVOCATE DIVISION
OF THE
TENNESSEE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

November 7, 2017

Contents

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS	4
RATE MORATORIUM	6
OPERATING MARGIN	7
AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS	7
PROOF OF FINANCIAL SECURITY	9
LATE PAYMENT FEE	10

Q1. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION FOR THE RECORD.

A1. My name is David N. Dittemore. My business address is Office of the Tennessee

Attorney General, UBS Tower, 315 Deaderick Street, Nashville, TN 37243. I am a

Financial Analyst employed by the Consumer Protection and Advocate Division of
the Tennessee Attorney General's Office (Consumer Advocate).

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Q2. PLEASE PROVIDE A SUMMARY OF YOUR BACKGROUND AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.

I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration from the A2. University of Central Missouri in 1982. I am a Certified Public Accountant licensed in the state of Oklahoma (#7562). I was previously employed by the Kansas Corporation Commission (KCC) in various capacities, including Managing Auditor, Chief Auditor and Director of the Utilities Division, responsible for the regulatory oversight of all investor-owned utilities in Kansas and managing a staff of forty professionals. For approximately four years, I was self-employed as a Utility Regulatory Consultant representing primarily the KCC Staff in regulatory issues. I also participated in proceedings in Georgia and Vermont, evaluating issues involving electricity and telecommunications regulatory issues. Additionally, I performed a consulting engagement for Kansas Gas Service (KGS), my subsequent employer during this time frame. For eleven years I served as Manager and subsequently Director of Regulatory Affairs for KGS, the largest natural gas utility in Kansas serving approximately 625,000 customers. KGS is a division of One Gas, a natural gas utility serving approximately two million customers in Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas. I joined the Tennessee Attorney General's Office in September, 2017 as a Financial Analyst. Overall, I have 30 years of experience in the field of public utility regulation. I have presented testimony as an expert witness on a number of occasions. Attached as Exhibit 1 is a detailed vitae of my background.

1 2	Q3.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION?	
3	A3.	No, I have not.	
4	Q4.	ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING?	
5	A4.	I am testifying on behalf of the Consumer Advocate.	
6	Q5.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?	
7 8 9 10	A5.	The purpose of my testimony is to support the Consumer Advocate's position, concerns and recommendations regarding the Integra Water Tennessee LLC (IWT) petition for approval of a certificate of public convenience and necessity (CCN) and approval of rates in providing wastewater service in the Casey Cove subdivision.	
11	Q6.	SUMMARIZE THE REQUEST OF INTEGRA IN THIS MATTER.	
12 13 14 15 16	A6.	IWT seeks authority to provide wastewater service to the Casey Cove subdivision within DeKalb County, Tennessee. The subdivision has the capacity to serve 31 dwellings. The proposed monthly service rate is \$90, with a proposed reconnection charge of \$100 and a late payment penalty of 10% ¹ . A security deposit of one times the monthly service fee, or \$90, is also proposed.	
17		SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS	
18	Q7.	SUMMMARIZE THE RECOMMENDATIONS YOU ARE SUPPORTING.	
19 20	A7.	I recommend the Tennessee Public Utility Commission (TPUC) adopt the proposed \$90 monthly service charge with the following conditions:	
21		1. The monthly service rate of \$90 shall not increase for the lesser of:	
22		a. Five years or	

¹ Integra Water amended tariff filing submitted June 23, 2017.

1		b. Such time as IWT attains the full build-out of the Casey Cove		
2		subdivision, serving 31 customers.		
3		2. Future rates of IWT should be determined using an Operating Margin.		
4		3. Any IWT affiliate providing services to IWT shall be required to cooperate with		
5		future regulatory inquiries supporting the affiliate costs incurred by IWT.		
6		4. Proof of Financial Security should be provided as a condition of the granting of		
7		the CCN.		
8		5. The late payment penalty fee should be reduced to 1%.		
9	Q8.	DO YOU BELIEVE IWT HAS THE MANAGERIAL EXPERTISE TO		
10		OPERATE A WASTEWATER TREATMENT UTILITY?		
11	A8.	Yes.		
12	Q9.	HAVE YOU REVIEWED THE PROJECTED FINANCIAL RESULTS OF IWT		
13		CONTAINED IN THE INITIAL PETITION?		
14	A9.	Yes. IWT projects a net loss in excess of \$17 Thousand and \$4 Thousand in the first		
15		two years of operations, respectively. While this is somewhat concerning, it is not		
16		unexpected given the ramp-up of revenues while the new development is under		
17		construction. IWT anticipates to become net income positive in year three of its		
18		operations.		
19	Q10.	DO YOU BELIEVE IWT HAS THE FINANCIAL CAPABILITY TO PROVIDE		
20		WASTEWATER SERVICE TO ITS CUSTOMERS?		
21	A10.	Yes.		
22	Q11.	ARE YOU CONCERNED WITH THE MAGNITUDE OF THE \$90 MONTHLY		
23		SERVICE RATE?		
24	A11.	Yes, however there are two important and unique mitigating factors present in this		
25		situation. First, the development by nature is relatively small and somewhat remote,		
26		thus there are not currently economies of scale that would be present in larger		

developments. If Integra Water, parent of IWT, expands its operations (whether in Tennessee or elsewhere), economies of scale may occur with respect to administrative and general costs, producing cost efficiencies that may accrue to IWT customers in future rate determinations. Secondly, due to the fact that the IWT is not yet operational, the prospective customers will have knowledge of the wastewater charge <u>prior</u> to making a decision to purchase property in the Casey Cove subdivision. Therefore, the prospective IWT customers are not yet 'captive' and can weigh the impact of the wastewater monthly fee prior to acquiring property and becoming an IWT customer².

A12.

RATE MORATORIUM

- Q12. ADDRESS YOUR FIRST RECOMMENDED CONDITION, THAT THE
 PROPOSED RATES SHOULD NOT INCREASE FOR THE LESSOR OF FIVE
 YEARS, OR UNTIL THE DEVELOPMENT IS FULLY BUILT OUT.
 - The purpose of this condition is to provide some protection to prospective IWT customers that the service charge will not increase in the near-term, or until such time as the development is fully built out. This places the short-term risk that the build-out will not occur as rapidly as anticipated on IWT investors, rather than its ratepayers. This risk would be in place for no more than five-years at such time IWT would have the authority to seek rate relief going forward to recover prudently incurred cost increases or shortfalls in revenue if the development does not materialize as planned. If the build-out results in the full complement of 31 customers within the five years, IWT could then seek rate relief prior to the five-year stay out provision. This recommendation attempts to strike a balance in sharing the risk that development will not materialize between IWT investors and its ratepayers. In the long-term, IWT customers will incur higher rates if the development does not materialize as expected. The five-year rate moratorium would permit IWT to petition for new rates that would be effective on the five-year anniversary of the TPUC order approving the CCN.

² Obviously, IWT customers will become 'captive' once they acquire property and therefore will not have the ability to avoid future IWT rate increases.

OPERATING MARGIN

1		<u>OPERATING MARGIN</u>
2	Q13.	DID THE CCN REQUEST CONTAIN ANY REQUEST REGARDING HOW
3		THE ADEQUACY OF RATES WOULD BE EVALUATED IN FUTURE
4		REGULATORY FILINGS?
5	A13.	No. While technically such a determination is not necessary within this Docket, I
6		believe it would be helpful for TPUC to make such a finding at this time so stakeholders
7		would have the issue resolved, thus resolving one issue that would otherwise be in
8		contention in the next rate proceeding. This issue would also provide some clarity to
9		IWT and allow for better financial planning.
10	Q14.	WHAT OPERATING MARGIN DO YOU BELIEVE WOULD BE
11		APPROPRIATE TO USE IN CALCULATING FUTURE REVENUE
12		REQUIREMENT CALCULATIONS?
13	A14.	I am recommending that an operating ratio of 6.5% be applied in future IWT revenue
14		requirement calculations. This is the operation ratio adopted in Docket No. 15-00130
15		in the rate proceeding of Integrated Resource Management Inc. For purposes of
16		calculating the revenue requirement, taxes and depreciation/amortization expense are
17		added to Operating expenses and the margin is determined as a percentage of this total.
18		AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS
19	Q15.	CAN YOU IDENTIFY THE AFFILIATES OF IWT?
20	A15.	IWT is owned by Integra Water LLC. Other affiliates of IWT include the following
21		LLC's: Integra Water Baldwin, Integra Water Creola, Integra Water Madison County,
22		Old North State Water Company, South Carolina Water Company and Integra Water
23		Services ³ . Envirolink was initially identified as an affiliate in the pre-filed testimony of
24		Mr. Michael J. Myers and was designated to provide operational and technical support

to IWT4. However, in CPAD Discovery Request #1-5 and #2-2, IWT indicated that

25

³ IWT Response to CPAD Discovery Request #1-5. ⁴ TPUC Discovery Request #2-2.

Envirolink is not an affiliate of IWT and until the TPUC draft affiliate rules are clarified, Envirolink will not provide services to IWT. As a result, IWT indicated the services formerly to be provided by Envirolink will now be provided by a third party or through 'allocated cost'⁵. Further, IWT has indicated such costs will be higher than the cost of services that would have been provided by Envirolink, but there has been no evidence provided to support this conclusion⁶.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 Q16. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT SERVICES PROVIDED BY AFFILIATES 8 WARRANT CLOSE REGULATORY SCRUTINY?

Yes. The theoretical regulatory concern with affiliate transactions is that captive 9 A16. monopoly customers may incur excessive costs due to the potential for self-dealing. If 10 affiliate services are performed at a cost higher than that which could be obtained in the 11 open (competitive) market, ratepayers bear the excessive costs. Therefore, affiliate 12 transactions need special regulatory focus because there is a natural economic incentive 13 to rely upon such services, regardless of the price, if such costs may be passed on to 14 captive customers. This is not to pre-judge affiliate transactions and suggest that all 15 such services produce excessive utility costs, but rather to indicate that such transactions 16 require regulatory review. 17

18 Q17. WHAT PRICING STANDARD SHOULD APPLY TO TRANSACTIONS 19 PROVIDED BY AN AFFILIATE TO A REGULATED UTILITY?

20 A17. The cost of such product or service should be the lower of the actual cost of the affiliate 21 providing the service, or the market price for such service from an independent third 22 party. Verification of this pricing standard requires access to the underlying books and 23 records of the affiliate to ensure ratepayers are not incurring excessive costs.

⁵ CPAD Discovery Response #2-4(a). Presumably through the use of the phrase "allocated cost," IWT is indicating the services will be provided by Integra Water LLC, its parent.

⁶ IWT has not amended its financial forecast to incorporate the claim its costs will increase since certain services will no longer be provided by Envirolink. These additional costs would increase the losses forecasted in the first two years of IWT operations.

- 1 Q18. DO YOU RECOMMEND THAT TPUC REQUIRE COOPERATION OF IWT 2 AFFFILIATES IN ORDER TO REVIEW AFFILIATE TRANSACTIONS TO
- THE EXTENT SUCH COSTS ARE INCLUDED IN FUTURE REVENUE
- 4 REQUIREMENT REQUESTS?
- 5 A18. Yes. IWT should have the burden of proof to demonstrate that such affiliate products
- and services were acquired at the lower of cost or market. IWT and its affiliates should
- 7 retain the necessary records to meet this burden of proof for review by TPUC and the
- 8 Consumer Advocate.

9

PROOF OF FINANCIAL SECURITY

- 10 Q19. CAN YOU IDENTIFY THE PROOF OF FINANCIAL SECURITY
- 11 REQUIREMENTS FOR THOSE WASTEWATER UTILITIES SUBMITTING
- 12 AN INITIAL APPLICATION FOR A CCN?
- 13 A19. The current TPUC requirements are found in Chapter 1220-4-13-07(2)(b), which
- indicate that those wastewater utilities initially seeking a CCN are required to provide
- financial security in the amount of \$20,000. Subsequent to the application, the
- wastewater utility shall provide security prior to providing service in the amount of
- \$20,000 or 100% of forecasted revenues, whichever is greater. In this instance, IWT is
- required to obtain proof of financial security of \$20,000 as required to obtain a CCN.
- Since forecasted revenues are less than \$20,000 in the initial year of operation, the
- financial security would remain at \$20,000 at the time IWT initiates service⁷.

⁷ New Draft Rules would permit IWT to reduce the Financial Security at the time service is initiated to the amount of annual forecasted revenues. I do not recommend that IWT's security be reduced.

1 O20. WHAT FORM WOULD THE FINANCIAL SECURITY TAKE?

- 2 A20. The financial security may be in the form of a bond issued by a licensed commercial
- bonding or insurance company or an irrevocable letter of credit issued by a financial
- 4 institution acceptable to TPUC.

5 Q21. HAS IWT OBTAINED THE REQUIRED FINANCIAL SECURITY?

- 6 A21. No. CPAD Discovery Response #1-7 (as of October 20, 2017) indicates that the
- bonding company is processing the request and IWT will update this response as
- 8 necessary.

9

LATE PAYMENT FEE

10 Q22. WHAT IS THE LATE PAYMENT FEE PROPOSED BY IWT

- 11 A22. The late payment fee in the initial Petition was identified as 1%, however in the amended
- Petition the late fee is listed as 10%. In CPAD Discovery Requests #2-22 and #2-23,
- 13 IWT indicates the reference to a 10% late fee is in error and the intent is to charge a late
- payment fee of 1%. I agree with the proposal referenced in these two responses and
- recommend the Amended Tariff be modified to reflect the 1% late fee. This fee should
- also be calculated using simple interest and not compounding.

17 Q23. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

18 **A23.** Yes.

EXHIBIT DND-1 David N. Dittemore Vitae

David Dittemore

Experience

Areas of Specialization

Approximately thirty-year experience in evaluating and preparing regulatory analysis, including revenue requirements, mergers and acquisitions, utility accounting and finance issues and public policy aspects of utility regulation. Presented testimony on behalf of my employers and clients in natural gas, electric, telecommunication and transportation matters covering a variety of issues.

Tennessee Attorney General's Office; **Financial Analyst September**, **2017** – **Current** Responsible for evaluation of utility proposals on behalf of the Attorney General's office including water, wastewater and natural gas utility filings. Prepare analysis and expert witness testimony documenting findings and recommendations.

Kansas Gas Service; Director Regulatory Affairs 2014 – 2017; Manager Regulatory Affairs, 2007 - 2014

Responsible for directing the regulatory activity of Kansas Gas Service (KGS), a division of ONE Gas, serving approximately 625,000 customers throughout central and eastern Kansas. In this capacity I have formulated strategic regulatory objectives for KGS, formulated strategic legislative options for KGS and led a Kansas inter-utility task force to discuss those options, participated in ONE Gas financial planning meetings, hired and trained new employees and provided recommendations on operational procedures designed to reduce regulatory risk. Responsible for the overall management and processing of base rate cases (2012 and 2016). I also played an active role, including leading negotiations on behalf of ONE Gas in its Separation application from its former parent, ONEOK, before the Kansas Corporation Commission. I have monitored regulatory earnings, and continually determine potential ratemaking outcomes in the event of a rate case filing. I ensure that all required regulatory filings, including surcharges are submitted on a timely and accurate basis. I also am responsible for monitoring all electric utility rate filings to evaluate competitive impacts from rate design proposals.

Strategic Regulatory Solutions; 2003 -2007

Principal; Serving clients regarding revenue requirement and regulatory policy issues in the natural gas, electric and telecommunication sectors

Williams Energy Marketing and Trading; 2000-2003

Manager Regulatory Affairs; Monitored and researched a variety of state and federal electric regulatory issues. Participated in due diligence efforts in targeting investor owned electric utilities for full requirement power contracts. Researched key state and federal rules to identify potential advantages/disadvantages of entering a given market.

MCI WorldCom; 1999 - 2000

Manager, Wholesale Billing Resolution; Manage a group of professionals responsible for resolving Wholesale Billing Disputes greater than \$50K. During my tenure, completed disputes increased by over 100%, rising to \$150M per year.

Kansas Corporation Commission; 1984- 1999

Utilities Division Director - 1997 - 1999; Responsible for managing employees with the goal of providing timely, quality recommendations to the Commission covering all aspects of natural gas, telecommunications and electric utility regulation; respond to legislative inquiries as requested; sponsor expert witness testimony before the Commission on selected key regulatory issues; provide testimony before the Kansas legislature on behalf of the KCC regarding proposed utility legislation; manage a budget in excess of \$2 Million; recruit professional staff; monitor trends, current issues and new legislation in all three major industries; address personnel issues as necessary to ensure that the goals of the agency are being met; negotiate and reach agreement where possible with utility personnel on major issues pending before the Commission including mergers and acquisitions; consult with attorneys on a daily basis to ensure that Utilities Division objectives are being met.

Asst. Division Director - 1996 - 1997; Perform duties as assigned by Division Director. Chief of Accounting 1990 - 1995; Responsible for the direct supervision of 9 employees within the accounting section; areas of responsibility included providing expert witness testimony on a variety of revenue requirement topics; hired and provided hands-on training for new employees; coordinated and managed consulting contracts on major staff projects such as merger requests and rate increase proposals;

Managing Regulatory Auditor, Senior Auditor, Regulatory Auditor 1984 - 1990; Performed audits and analysis as directed; provided expert witness testimony on numerous occasions before the KCC; trained and directed less experienced auditors onsite during regulatory reviews.

Amoco Production Company 1982 - 1984

Accountant Responsible for revenue reporting and royalty payments for natural gas liquids at several large processing plants.

Education

- B.S.B.A. (Accounting) Central Missouri State University
- Passed CPA exam; (Oklahoma certificate # 7562) Not a license to practice

IN THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE:)	
)	
PETITION OF INTEGRA WATER)	
TENNESSEE, LLC FOR A)	DOCKET NO. 17-00014
CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC)	
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY AND)	
AUTHORITY TO CHARGE RATES IN)	
CASEY COVE SUBDIVISION LOCATED)	
IN DEKALB COUNTY, TENNESSEE)	

AFFIDAVIT

I, Devid N. Diffusion behalf of the Consumer Protection and Advocate Division of the Attorney General's Office, hereby certify that the attached Direct Testimony represents my opinion in the above-referenced case and the opinion of the Consumer Advocate Division.

David N. Dittemore

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 7th day of Morente, 2017.

NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires: 11/3/20