Edward S. Finley, Jr., PLLC 2024 White Oak Rd. Raleigh, NC 27608 919-418-4516 edfinley98@aol.com (N.C. Bar No. 6149)

March 14, 2024

Ms. Shonta Dunston, Chief Clerk North Carolina Utilities Commission Mail Service Center 4325 Raleigh NC 27699 -4300

RE: Docket Nos. W-1034, Sub 13

Dear Ms. Dunston:

Please accept for filing the following document in the above captioned dockets: Direct Testimony of Dennis Abbott on behalf of Water Resources, Inc.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely, Edward S. Finley, Jr. Counsel for Water Resources, Inc.

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and exact copy of the foregoing direct testimony of Dennis Abbott on behalf of Water Resources, Inc. was duly served upon parties of record either by depositing same in a depository of the United States Postal Service, first class postage prepaid, or by electronic delivery.

This the 14th day of March, 2024.

Edward S. Finley, Jr.,

/s/ Edward S. Finley, Jr.

Edward S. Finley, Jr., PLLC 2024 White Oak Rd. Raleigh, NC 27608 919-418-4516 edfinley98@aol.com

**COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT** 

## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION RALEIGH

Docket No. W-1034, Sub 13

In the Matter of		
Application of Water Resources, Inc.	)	Testimony of
For Approval of Rates for the Rocky River	)	Dennis Abbott
Subdivision in Mecklenburg County and	)	for Water Resources
the River Walk service area in	)	Inc.
Cabarrus County North Carolina	)	

### BEFORE THE NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION

**DOCKET NO. W-1034, SUB 13** 

**Direct Testimony of Dennis Abbott** 

On Behalf of Water Resources, Inc.

March 14, 2024

1	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
2	A.	Dennis C. Abbott. 6201 Fairview Rd. Suite 200, Charlotte, North Carolina 28210
4 5	Q.	WITH WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
6 7 8	A.	I am President of Water Resources, Inc.
9 10	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT PREFILED TESTIMONY?
11 12 13 14 15	A.	The purpose of my direct prefiled testimony is to sponsor the Application for a rate adjustment for the Rocky River service area in Mecklenburg County, and the River Walk service area in Cabarrus County, that Water Resources (WRI or The Company) has submitted in this docket and to provide background and other information to place into context Water Resource's need for rate relief.
17 18 19 20	Q.	WHEN WERE CURRENT RATES PLACED INTO EFFECT, AND HAVE EXISTING RATES BEEN ADEQUATE DO SUPPORT NECESSARY IMPROVEMENTS, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF THE SYSTEM?
21 22 23 24	A.	Current rates were placed into effect in Docket No. W-1034, Sub 8 in 2018. For most of that period those rates have been in effect the rates have been insufficient to support necessary improvements, maintenance and operations of the system.
25 26 27 28	Q.	AN ISSUE IN THE PAST HAS BEEN THE NEED FOR INSTALLATION OF METERS IN THE SYSTEM AND OTHER SERVICE-RELATED ISSUES. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE EFFORTS OF THE COMPANY TO INSTALL THE METERS AND ADDRESS OTHER SUCH ISSUES.
30 31 32	A.	In the Commission's November 21, 2018 Recommended Order Approving Agreed Upon Rates and Requiring Customer Notice, Application by Water Resources, Inc, for Authority to Increase Rates for Water Utility Service in the Rocky River

Plantation Subdivision in Cabarrus County and River Walk Subdivision in

Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, Docket No. W-1034 Sub 8, the Commission required the Company to make system improvements such as the replacing of aging water meters.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 2

> The Commission required the Public Staff to investigate and file a report and recommendation. On September 20, 2021, the Public Staff submitted its report. In its report the Public Staff concluded that WRI was largely in compliance with the actions required by the 2018 rate case order, although WRI had failed to complete several items within the time frame specified by the Commission. The Public Staff concluded that most of the items identified by DEQ notices of violation had been addressed and thus had little or no impact on WRI's ability to adequately serve its customers. The Public Staff concluded that while WRI has not yet complied with the Consent Judgment by interconnection with the Town of Harrisburg water system or executing an alternative course of action to comply with the state drinking water laws, WRI has retained an experienced water engineer who was exploring a possible, lower cost method of compliance. The Public Staff concluded that given WRI's overall compliance with the 2018 rate case order and feedback received from DEQ personnel, an appointment of an emergency operator should not be ordered at that time. In this report the Public Staff listed items Water Resources needed to address for complete for full compliance.

2122

23

24

25

Q. BY ORDER DATED JULY 29, 2022, THE COMMISSION ISSUED AN ORDER REQUIRING COMPLIANCE WITH 2018 RATE CASE ORDER AND DEQ NOTICES OF VIOLATION AND CONSENT JUDGMENT AND REQUIRING FILING OF FURTHER REPORTS. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ACTION WATER RESOURCES TOOK IN RESPONSE TO THIS COMMISSION ORDER.

2627

28

29

30

A. On August 8, 2022, Water Resources submitted an updated report. In its report the Company submitted a chart that listed the items identified for its updated report and a status and narrative explanation. Except for the interconnection with the

Town of Harrisburg the Company reported that nearly all of the other items the Commission required it to address had been completed or corrected

Q. IN THE COMMISSION'S JULY 29 ORDER, THE COMMISSION REQUIRED WATER RESOURCES TO ADDRESS METHODS TO OBTAIN CUSTOMER FEEDBACK AND IMPROVE COMMUNICATIONS. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COMPANY'S EFFORTS TO COMPLY WITH THAT REQUIREMENT.

A. Pursuant to decretal paragraph 4 of the Commission's July 29 Order, Water Resources was required to file on or before January 30, 2023, a report on its efforts to create a website, form a customer advisory group, or otherwise institute means to obtain customer feedback and improve communications between WRI and its customers, specifically including notice of flushing activities.

On January 30, 2023, Water Resources filed a report on efforts to create a website, form a customer advisory group, and other means to improve customer communications. Water Resources reported that it found that existing communications channels accomplished the function of a customer advisory group, although not named as such, by providing a means to poll the members of the representative customer groups regarding their experiences with water pressure, water quality, and other issues related to the Company's operations.

With respect to River Walk, the Company reported that communications with the HOA leadership provides a representative group of customers that are presumably selected by other members of the HOA through a democratic process built into the HOA governance structure. With respect to Rocky River, the Company reported that it proactively contacts this group of customers to gain insight into their experience and those of their neighbors, and any concerns brought to the Company's attention are addressed and the Company follow up with the homeowners is provided.

1	Q.	WHAT DID THE COMPANY'S JANUARY 30, 2023, REPORT SAY ABOUT
2		SYSTEM FLUSHING?

A. With respect to system flushing, the Company reported that it only performs system flushing on an as needed basis. The Company reported that the need for flushing during the prior six months, subsequent to the Commission's July 29 order, had been limited, and the Company had not received reports of discolored water from customers. Water Resources committed to continue to make every attempt to alert customers when flushing is necessary and to limit the disruption of customers that flushing activities may cause.

11

# 12 Q. IN ITS JANUARY 30, 2023, REPORT WHAT INFORMATION DID THE 13 COMPANY PROVIDE WITH RESPECT TO QUARTERLY CUSTOMER 14 CONTACT LOGS?

15

16 A. The Company reported that it continues to file quarterly customer contact logs with
17 the Commission in Docket No. W-1034, Sub 8. The Company maintained that its
18 customer contact logs demonstrate a continued improvement in customer service
19 and an increasing level of satisfaction with the Water Resource responsiveness
20 and resolution of concerns.

21

Q. WHEN WAS THE LAST CUSTOMER LOG FILED WITH COMMISSION IN DOCKET NO. W-1034, SUB 8?

24

25 A. January 17, 2024.

26

Q. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE CUSTOMER REACTION AND
COMMUNICATION TO THE SERVICE THEY RECEIVED DURING AND
SUBSEQUENT THE TEST PERIOD IN THIS DOCKET?

1	A.	For the most part, the Company records do not indicate a substantial number of
2		complaints.

Q. IN YOUR OPINION HAS WATER RESOURCES COMPLIED WITH THE
 REQUIREMENTS LISTED BY THE COMMISSION IN ITS JANUARY 29, 2022,
 ORDER?

7

8 A. Yes.

9

10 Q. IS THE TIMING OF THE COMPANY'S REQUEST TO INCREASE ITS RATES
11 BASED UPON THE COST OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN
12 NECESSARY TO RECTIFY THE NEED TO TAKE THE COMPANY'S WELL #1
13 OFFLINE?

14

15 A. Yes.

16

17 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY IT WAS NECESSARY TO DISCONTINUE USE OF
18 WELL #1 AND WHAT ACTION THE COMPANY WAS REQUIRED TO TAKE IN
19 RESPONSE TO THE DISCONTINUANCE.

20

21 A. The water system serving the Rocky River subdivision initially had two wells 22 installed in accordance with state requirements to be enforced by the Public Water 23 Supply Section of the Department of Environmental Quality. Two wells are 24 necessary in case one must be taken down or is inoperable. North Carolina 25 Administrative Code, Title15A, Subchapter 18C, Rule .0402(g)(5) [15A NCAC 18C 26 .0402(g)(5)] requires that a residential community water system, using well water 27 as its source of supply and designed to serve 50 or more connections, must 28 provide at least two wells. If a second well cannot be provided, another approved 29 water supply source may be accepted.

In 2021 required periodic test results revealed that the groundwater source from which one of the Company's two wells drew water displayed excess levels of radium, above standard thresholds established by the environmental agency. That finding led Water Resources voluntarily to take the well offline. The problem was the natural elements in the groundwater as opposed to inappropriate treatment or improper operation by the utility at the well. The Company had to take Well #1 out of service to protect the health and safety of its customers, because it was contaminated due to the Combined Radium Maximum Contaminant Level in three consecutive quarters. Taking Well #1 out of service was based on the recommendation of staff at NC DEQ. Water Resources was aware at the time that Well #1 was taken out of service that doing so would trigger a violation of 15A N.C.A.C. 18C .0402(g)(5) and has sought to resolve that violation since that action was taken. In August 2019, the Company informed the staff at the NCDEQ, that Well #1 was going to be taken out of service. On August 12, 2019, the Company presented its plan of action to NCDEQ to install a new connection with the Town of Harrisburg in response to the required deactivation of Well #1. In addition, the Company has had ongoing conversations with NC DEQ and the Public Staff regarding this situation, including compliance filings filed with the Commission in Dockets Nos. W-1034, Sub 8 and 10.

20

2122

23

24

25

2627

28

29

30

31

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Even though the Company's decision to take Well #1 offline was the result of conditions beyond the Company's control, the discontinuance nevertheless placed the Company in technical violation of the requirements of the Division of Water Resources. As a result, an action was filed in the Superior Court through which the Division of Water Resources sought to obtain an injunction to force the Company to rectify the fact that only one well was available. The State asked for authority to hold the Company in contempt for its failure to rectify the problem. After the action was filed, on November 7, 2022, the parties entered into an Amended Consent Decree that set forth requirements Water Resources was obligated to meet. Failure could have resulted in a finding of contempt. However, the standard for imposition of sanctions for failure to comply with the Amended Consent Decree

was that the Company would have been shown to be willfuly out of compliance.

No showing or finding of willful noncompliance was made.

## Q. WHAT EFFORTS DID THE COMPANY TAKE TO RECTIFY THE SITUATION RISING FROM THE DISCONTINUATION OF THE SECOND WELL?

A. Efforts were made to identify any available alternatives. It was not possible to drill and install a new well. One potential alternative was to interconnect with the Town of Harrisburg water system. An initial obstacle encountered in pursuing that option was that the property owner along the route for the needed interconnection piping refused to provide an easement. After substantial time-consuming negotiation and efforts to persuade her to agree, including a threat of condemnation, she finally did agree to supply the easement in exchange of a payment.

# Q. AFTER ENCOUNTERING DELAYS AND OBSTACLES IN THE COMPANY'S EFFORTS TO INTERCONNECT WITH THE TOWN OF HARRISBURG, DID THE COMPANY INVESTIGATED OTHER ALTERNATIVES?

A. Yes. Water Resources hired an additional expert engineer to attempt to identify other alternatives that possibly could have resulted in a quicker and less costly remedy. He suggested that perhaps the situation could be rectified by an enhanced or enlarged green sand filter for the well that had been taken offline. Tests were undertaken to see if this option was available. This would have been much quicker and less expensive. Ultimately the tests indicated that this expanded green sand filter option was not available.

Water Resources then returned to pursuing the option of interconnection with the Town of Harrisburg.

1	Q.	IN ADDITION TO THE OBSTACLE OF INABILITY TO OBTAIN AN EASEMENT
2		WHAT OTHER OBSTACLES DID THE COMPANY ENCOUNTER IN ITS
3		EFFORT TO INTERCONNECT WITH THE TOWN OF HARRISBURG?

A. One obstacle and delay involved approval of NC Department of Transportation and the effort to obtain a meeting on the site to authorize a bore under a road. After a delay the bore was approved.

#### Q. DID THE COMPANY ENCOUNTER SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES?

11 A. Yes. An issue arose over the appropriate valve to be installed at the
12 interconnection point with the Town of Harrisburg. Purchase of water from the
13 Town of Harrisburg would be needed at times when capacity from the single
14 operating well was inadequate. There were supply chain issues to deal with in
15 obtaining this valve. The valve is a Zurn valve.

### 17 Q. WHAT ACTIONS DID WATER RESOURCES TAKE WHILE AWAITING THE 18 AVAILABILITY AND DELIVERY OF THE ZERN VALVE?

20 A. Water Resources purchased nearly all the materials for installation of piping and other materials while awaiting the delivery of the Zern valve.

Q. DID WATER RESOURCES ENCOUNTER OBSTACLES IN THE DESIGN AND INSTALLATION OF THE VAULT IN WHICH TO PLACE THE VALVE NECESSARY FOR THE INTERCONNECTION WITH THE TOWN OF HARRISBURG?

A. Yes. The initial plans and specifications called for a vault in which the valve was to be placed that met the specifications of the City of Charlotte (CMUD). The Town had approved these specifications. However, when the Water Resources contractor contacted the Town of Harrisburg to make sure that the Town was still

agreeable to the vault that met those specifications, the Town replied instead that the vault specifications had to meet the requirements of Cabarrus County. That resulted in additional delay.

#### Q. WHAT ACTION DID WATER RESOURCES TAKE IN RESPONSE?

A. Tyler Truxell of Core and Main, which was responsible for supplying the materials for the project, e-mailed Water Resources and its contractor, and said that the 4-inch meter vault lid and hatch to meet the Town's requirements had to be custom made. The lid could not be poured until Dellinger Precast had the hatch. Water Resources was informed that the lid and hatch was estimated to be shipped from the US Foundry on August 29, 2023. Core and Main reported "So, once it arrives and is cast-in the lid I would estimate the delivery date of August/first week of September 2023."

16 Q. WERE INSPECTIONS AND APPROVALS OF THE TOWN AND THE DIVISION
17 OF WATER RESOURCES REQUIRED BEFORE THE COMPANY COULD
18 ACTIVATE THE INTERCONNECTION WITH THE TOWN?

20 A. Yes. Scheduling these inspections approvals resulted in additional delays.

## Q. WAS THE IN INTERCONNECTION ULTIMATELY APPROVED AND ACTIVATED?

25 A. Yes. The interconnection was ultimately approved and activated, and on December 6, 2023 Water Resources informed the Public Water Supply Section of the Division of Water Resources of the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality that the project had been completed in accordance with the engineering plans and specifications approved and has resulted in an Operation and Maintenance Plan and Emergency Management Plan which has a certified

operator with access to aforementioned plans and is available to the Department upon request.

Water Resources will rely upon this interconnection at a time when the output of its remaining well proves inadequate to meet the demand on the system. It will be necessary for Water Resources to compensate the Town for water it purchases through the interconnection.

Q. BETWEEN THE PERIOD WHEN THE WELL #1 WAS DISCONTINUED AND THE INTERCONNECTION WITH THE TOWN OF HARRISBURG WAS ACTIVATED, WAS SERVICE TO CUSTOMERS IMPAIRED?

13 A. No. But for a brief encounter that did not arise from inability to meet demand from
14 the remaining well, service to customers was not interrupted. Fortunately the
15 customers in the subdivision have not actually experienced a lack of water supply
16 resulting from the discontinuation of the second well. Still, Water Resources has
17 continued to undertake efforts to rectify the fact that there is only one well was in
18 operation and did not minimize the seriousness of the situation.

Q. DURING THE PERIOD THAT THE WELL #1 WAS DISCONNECTED, AND THE
COMPANY ENGAGED IN ACTIVATING THE INTERCONNECTION WITH THE
TOWN OF HARRISBURG, WHAT EFFORTS WERE REQUIRED ON THE
COMPANY'S BEHALF TO RESPOND TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES?

A. Water Resources provided the Water Supply Section with a weekly report of its activities in seeking to resolve these pending issues. Water Resources was required to report to the Superior Court to explain its efforts to address the State's action seeking to hold the Company in contempt should the Company fail to adequately comply with the Amended Consent Decree.

1	Q.	WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE ACTION IN SUPERIOR COURT?
2		
3	A.	The Division of Water Resources is now satisfied that Water Resources has taken
4		the appropriate steps to rectify the loss of Well #1, and the action before the
5		Superior Court has concluded.
6		
7	Q.	DID THE COMPANY ATTEMPT TO KEEP THE PUBLIC STAFF AND THE
8		COMMISSION INFORMED OF ITS EFFORTS AS IT ATTEMPTED TO RECTIFY
9		THE SITUATION ARISING FROM THE LOSS OF THE SECOND WELL?
10		
11	A.	Yes.
12		
13	Q.	HAS THE DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES ATTEMPTED TO PENALIZE
14		WATER RESOURCES FOR ITS FAILURE TO MAINTAIN THE TWO WELLS?
15		
16	A.	The State initially imposed fines. However, after Water Resources explained and
17		attempted to justify its actions in response to the loss of the second well, the State
18		rescinded the fines.
19		
20	Q.	IS THE TIMING OF THE COMPANY'S REQUEST FOR A RATE ADJUSTMENT
21		INFLUENCED BY THE EFFORTS AND EXPENSE IT UNDERTOOK TO
22		RECTIFY THE LOSS OF WELL #1?
23		
24	A.	Yes. Now that the interconnection with the Town of Harrisburg has been placed in
25		service and is online and available to serve customers, the Company has filed this
26		rate request in order to adjust its rates to begin to recover the costs in the
27		interconnection as well as the current cost of operating the system. Of course, in
28		the meantime the Company has been operating at a loss and has been required

to subsidize the costs and expenses incurred to maintain service to its customers.

1	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE COMPANY OBTAINED THE CAPITAL TO MAKE
2		THE APPROXIMATELY \$440,000 INVESTMENT IN THE INTERCONNECTION
3		WITH THE TOWN OF HARRISBURG?

A. As owner of Water Resources, I provided those funds through my own personal resources as well as additional funds to support the utility operations until the Company could file for a rate increase. At the present time the Company has not obtained third party financing for the Harrisburg interconnection. However, third party financing is under consideration.

10

11 Q. HAS WATER RESOURCES BEEN IN COMMUNICATION THE PUBLIC STAFF
12 ON THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN THIS DOCKET, AND HAS THE COMPANY
13 ATTEMPTED TO RESPOND TO PUBLIC STAFF DATA REQUESTS TO ASSIST
14 THE PUBLIC STAFF IN AUDITING THE COMPANY'S BOOKS AND IN
15 PREPARING THE PUBLIC STAFF TESTIMONY AND POSITION IN THIS
16 DOCKET?

17

18 A. Yes. The Company has responded and continues to respond to data requests.

19

Q. DURING THE TIME WATER RESOURCES HAS OWNED AND OPERATED THE
WATER SYSTEMS HAS THE COMPANY BEEN APPROPRIATELY
COMPENSATED FOR THE IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS THAT HAVE
BEEN MADE OR FOR THE OPERATIONS OF THE SYSTEM THAT HAVE BEEN
UNDERTAKEN ON THE COMPANY'S BEHALF?

25

A. No. The revenues that have been received have been inadequate. Water Resources has operated this system during its ownership at a substantial loss.

28

Q. ARE YOU SPONSORING THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED IN THIS DOCKET
AND DO YOU WISH THE COMMISSION TO ACCEPT IT INTO THE RECORD?

- 1 A. Yes. In addition, Peedin and Perry Consulting, LLC, was hired by the Company to 2 prepare the Company's Exhibit I and Exhibit II as well as the Company's 3 Application.
- Q. WHAT ACCOUNTING ADJUSTMENTS OR ITEMS OF INTEREST IN THE
  APPLICATION ARE NECESSARY FOR YOU TO BRING TO THE
  COMMISSION'S ATTENTION?

A. The Company's Exhibit I sets forth the following proforma adjustments for each of the Rocky River and River Walk service areas utilizing a test year in this proceeding of the twelve months ended December 31, 2022. I will briefly summarize the adjustments:

1. Rate Base: The Company made updates to plant in service to reflect the additions to utility plant in service since the last rate case in Docket No. 1034, Sub 8, including corresponding adjustments to depreciation expense and accumulated depreciation; the calculation of cash working capital using one-eighth of operation and maintenance expenses and the calculation of average tax accruals using one-half of property taxes plus one-fifth of payroll taxes.

 Miscellaneous revenues: The Company made adjustments to remove nonutility income related to the Verizon tower lease consistent with the Public Staff adjustments in the prior rate case.

3. Salaries: The Company made adjustments to include an ongoing annualized level of salaries for the owner and the office manager/bookkeeper. Due to cash flow concerns, Dennis Abbott, the Owner/ Manager of the Utility stopped taking a salary in 2022 but resumed his salary in 2023 as well as in 2024.

4. Administrative & office expense: The Company made an adjustment to include an annualized level of office rent, as well as provided updated office lease amounts for 2024.

Maintenance & repair expense: The Company made adjustments to reclassify certain expenses that should have been capitalized to plant in service during the test period.

- 6. Professional fees: The Company made adjustments to reclassify legal and engineering fees that relate directly to the Harrisburg Interconnection to plant in service for Rocky River that should have been capitalized when incurred. The remaining professional fees represent a normal ongoing level of legal and accounting expenses for regulatory proceedings that have been allocated to both the Rocky River and River Walk service areas.
- 7. Regulatory expenses: The Company included estimates for accounting consulting, legal and other expenses related to the mailing of customer notices and the filing fee and amortized these costs over a three-year period. The regulatory expenses will be trued up to actual as they become available.
- 8. Payroll taxes: The payroll taxes are based on the statutory rate of 7.65% and are applied to the payroll adjustments discussed earlier.
- 9. Income taxes: The state and federal income taxes are based on the statutory rates of 2.5% and 21%, respectively.

## 19 Q. FOR RETURN PURPOSES, IS WRI A RATE BASE COMPANY OR AN OPERATING RATIO COMPANY?

22 A. WRI is comprised of two separate service territories. The Rocky River service area 23 qualifies as a rate base Company. The Company is recommending that Rocky 24 River's return on rate base be based on 4.6% debt and 9.8% equity.

The River Walk service area qualifies as an operating ratio company. The Company is recommending that River Walk's return be calculated using an overall 7.2% return on operating revenue deductions. The basis for the return is founded on the similar returns for recent cases decided by the Commission for other water and sewer utilities in North Carolina.

2	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COMPANY'S EXHIBIT II

A. The Company's Exhibit II sets forth the rate design proposed by the Company for the Rocky River and River Walk service areas. For Rocky River, the Company proposes a base rate of \$54.01 and a usage rate of \$15.04 per 1,000 gallons. For River Walk, the Company proposes a base rate of \$48.69 and a usage rate of \$17.50 per 1,000 gallons.

8

1

#### 9 Q. DOES WRI KNOW OF ANY ISSUES AT THIS TIME?

10 A. No. Not at this time. Water Resources is unaware of what, if any, adjustments the
11 Public Staff may recommend at the conclusion of its audit and investigation.
12 However, Water Resources continues to respond to Public Staff data requests. To
13 the extent that the parties have unresolved issues as this case proceeds, Water

Resources will attempt to respond in its rebuttal testimony.

15 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

16

14

17 A. Yes.