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COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Good afternoon. Let's come to order and go on the record. I am Commissioner Jeff Hughes, presiding Commissioner for this hearing. With me today are Charlotte Mitchell, chair of the Utilities Commission, and Commissioners

ToNola D. Brown-Bland, Daniel G. Clodfelter, Kimberly W. Duffley, Floyd B. McKissick, and Karen Kemerait.

The Commission now calls for hearing Docket Number W-354, Sub 398, In the Matter of Application of Carolina Water Service of North Carolina, or the Company, to Establish the Rate Base for the Carteret County Water System Under the Fair Value Methodology Authorized by North Carolina General Statute §62-133.1A, Fair Value Application.

On July 26, 2022, the Company filed an application to determine the rate base value upon acquisition of the Carteret County Water System. Included in the application was a completed version of the Commission's fair value application form, an appraisal report by Hartman Consultants retained by
the Company, an appraisal report from Gannett Flemming retained by Carteret County, an appraisal report by NewGen Strategies and Solutions retained by the Public Staff, and an engineering assessment prepared by Draper Aden Associates.

The Company also filed the testimony of Donald H. Denton on July 26, 2022.

On August 5, 2022, the Public Staff filed a letter stating that the application was incomplete.

On August 11, 2022, the Commission issued an order finding the fair value application incomplete. The Company filed revised exhibits that same date.

On August 16, 2022, the Public Staff filed a letter stating that it deemed the Company's fair value application complete.

On September 13, 2022, the Commission issued an order establishing discovery guidelines, requiring customer notice, and scheduling hearings, in both this fair value application docket as well as in the related docket in which the Company seeks a certificate of convenience and necessity to operate the Carteret County Water System. That
docket is Docket Number W-354, Sub 399.
On October 17, 2022, the Public Staff filed a notice of affidavit, the affidavit of Lynne Feasel, direct testimony of Michael G. Lane, and direct testimony of Charles Junis.

On October 18, 2022, a public witness hearing for the purpose of receiving the testimony of customers regarding this proceeding, as well as Docket Number W-354, Sub 399, was held in Carteret County.

On October 24, 2022, Carteret County filed the rebuttal testimony of Eugene Foxworth.

On October 25, 2022, the Company filed rebuttal testimony of Donald H. Denton, III and Gerald C. Hartman.

On October 28, 2022, the Company filed -- excuse me -- the County filed a petition to intervene in this matter.

That brings us to today. Pursuant to North Carolina General Statutes §138A-15(e), I remind members of the Commission of our duty to avoid conflicts of interest, and inquire at this time as to whether any Commissioner has any known conflict of interest with respect to this docket.
(No response.)
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Let the record reflect that I have no such conflict and that my fellow Commissioners have not identified any such conflict.

We will now move forward with the proceeding and call on counsel to announce their appearances, beginning with the Company.

MS. SANFORD: Thank you, Commissioner Hughes. Excuse me. I am Jo Anne Sanford with the Sanford Law Office representing Carolina Water Service, Inc. of North Carolina today. With me is David Drooz of the Fox Rothschild firm, and present at counsel table is Mr. Donald H. Denton, who is the state president of Carolina Water. With that, I'll turn the mic to Mr. Wheatly.

MR. WHEATLY: My name is Claud Wheatly. I'm the county attorney for Carteret County. And sitting next to me is Mr. Gene Foxworth. In the audience we have the county manager, Mr. Tommy Burns, and our financial officer, Ms. Dee Meshaw, who will be available to answer any questions and present any testimony as required by this assembly. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Thank you-all. Public Staff.

MR. CREECH: Presiding Commissioner Hughes, my name is William Creech -- C. Creech. I'm joined here at the table with Bill Grantmyre -William Grantmyre. And seated to my left is Charles Junis of the Public Staff's water, sewer, and telecom division. Also in the room here with us is Gina Holt, who is an attorney of counsel -- I mean, and attorney with the Public Staff, and, of course, our appraiser, Mike Lane, is also present today. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Great to see everyone, especially Mr. Grantmyre.

MR. GRANTMYRE: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Before we get started with the witnesses, do the parties have any preliminary matters that need to be addressed?

MS. SANFORD: I do, Commissioner Hughes, thank you. And thank you for indulging us for just a few minutes while I address some procedural matters just to, kind of, square up with where we are and what we have proposed to do. We have our direct witness this morning, who filed direct
testimony for the Company, and that's Mr. Denton. We understand that the Commission would like to hear from the appraisers during the direct phase of this proceeding.

So after Mr. Denton, we propose to put up Mr. Hartman. He did not file direct testimony, but we are putting him up because we understand that's what's requested, and he would be available to the Commission, and ultimately to the parties for questions. And I'm saying this in terms of our intention, but I'm also saying it with a question mark at the end to be sure that what we're doing is what you have requested.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: So far so good. MS. SANFORD: So far so good. Okay. I'll keep going. Yesterday -- as an aside -- a quick aside, this is a case of first impression, and it's exciting for that reason, but it's also different. It's different, in terms of figuring out the procedure and the statute and the positions on it. Yesterday, the Commission asked a series of questions and asked the Company, through Mr. Denton, to respond to those questions.

So we scrambled. Mr. Schellinger, who

I've required to sit close by us here, worked diligently on this under Mr. Denton's direction, and they worked together, and so they have attempted to answer the Commission's questions, as many as are possible in the time frame.

Mr. Schellinger is here from Colombia, South Carolina, and is -- we have indicated this to all parties -- is available -- we're not sure what your wish is, but he is available if the Commission wishes to speak to him. He has done an exhibit, which Mr. Denton is prepared to introduce. We've given it to the Commission and to the Public Staff, if the Commission would like to go in that direction.

We're unclear and we are not trying to slip anything under the rug, it's just we've done what we thought was required. It is available if the Commission wishes to see it, and if not, then Mr. Denton is prepared to get on that stand and answer the questions to the best of his ability. If consideration of late-filed exhibits, whatever the Commission would wish to do with respect to following its interest in answers to questions. We are perfectly prepared to be cooperative with that,
of course.

And I think that, kind of, sums it up for where we see for the next few steps.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. I
appreciate that. Regarding the questions. We've reviewed some of the questions ourselves and realized that some of the questions might have been looking for specifics beyond Mr. Denton's knowledge. So we've actually revised the questions so that we think they're more appropriate for what we believe Mr . Denton has information regarding. So let's see how the questions go and --

MS. SANFORD: That sounds great. COMMISSIONER HUGHES: -- we'll take it that way.

MS. SANFORD: And he may be able -- he may be able to answer all the ones you originally asked, but we just -- I wanted to put it in the context of what we had attempted to do to try to come armed with responses, so thank you for that. COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. I should have let -- please, Mr. Grantmyre.

MR. GRANTMYRE: Bill Grantmyre, Public Staff. The Public Staff would vigorously oppose
them trying to enter into evidence, at this late date, anything that was not in the Commissioner's questions. You know, to answer the Commissioner's questions, that is fine. But I've been told there is one part of an exhibit that should have been part of their rebuttal testimony, has nothing to do with their Commissioner's questions, and they should have filed it in their rebuttal.

Now, the Company and the County put their attorney on to testify at the customer-only hearing, and he wasn't a customer. So they should not be allowed, again, to slip in something that was not part of your questions. Anything they have that was answered to your questions is fully acceptable, obviously. I think Mr. Junis has some answers, I hope, do you? He nodded his head yes. To clarify my health situation, my neurosurgeon, who I saw Tuesday, said I need to stop falling on my head. And just clarify also, when I took my three-hour cognitive test with a wonderful psychologist, she said I was above average for someone my age and education. Now, my wife will tell you I'm only 85 percent now. Anyway --

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Ms. Sanford, do you have a response? Not about the falling on the head.

MS. SANFORD: I will not go there. And thank you, I will be very brief, but to say one or two things that $I$ think are important here. First of all, this has been done hurriedly, and we presented this exhibit to the Public Staff and to the Commission. It hasn't been there with them long, because we hadn't been done with it long, and could have still been working.

So if there is a need for a motion to strike or simply to say the whole thing won't be in, that is fine. But there's been no effort to do anything, other than to be responsive and to be transparent with our opposing counsel.

And with respect to an insinuation -and I will speak on his behalf whether he wishes for me to or not -- but with respect to an insinuation that there was anything amiss about Mr. Wheatly, the form in which Mr. Wheatly's comments took at Beaufort, I would object to that. I think that's inaccurate.

MR. CREECH: Thank you for that. All I
would -- this is William Creech, again, with the Public Staff. All we would say is just to reiterate what Mr . Grantmyre indicated, that anything beyond the Commission's question in the exhibit, we would move to strike that. And, obviously, we have not had the opportunity to review what was submitted today, and certainly would want Mr . Denton to be the witness for the Company, given the testimony filed in this docket. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. As of now, I think we've agreed that we are gonna see how Mr. Denton does with the questions, and we will address the question of the exhibit if it comes up during questions.

Any other preliminary matters? Okay. Well, there are two pending motions that I will now address. First, as noted, Carteret County filed a petition to intervene on October 28, 2022; hearing no objection, the petition is granted.

Second, on October 14, 2022, the Public Staff filed a notice of affidavit giving notice that the affidavit of Lynne Feasel, financial manager of the accounting division of the Public

Staff, would be used in evidence in this proceeding pursuant to General Statutes $\$ 62-68$ in lieu of her oral testimony, unless an opposing party or the Commission sought the right to examine her in this hearing.

I understand that no party has sought to cross-examine Ms. Feasel, and the Commission has no questions for her. Therefore, hearing no objection, the Public Staff's motion to have Ms. Feasel's October 14, 2022, affidavit moved into evidence is granted. Okay.

So now we can move on to the witnesses. Ms. Sanford, please call your first witness.

MS. SANFORD: Thank you, Commissioner Hughes. I call Donald H. Denton, please. Whereupon,

DONALD H. DENTON, III, having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SANFORD:
Q. I started to say good morning, but I guess it's afternoon, Mr. Denton.

Would you state your name and address for the record, please?
A. My name is Donald Hemphill Denton, III. Address is 5821 Fairview Road, Charlotte, North Carolina 28209.
Q. And what is your position with Carolina Water?
A. President.
Q. Did you prepare and cause to be filed on July 26th, direct testimony consisting of nine pages?
A. I did.
Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to make to that testimony?
A. We struck one word, and that was in the direct. One word, which was -- I'm trying to think of the one word.
Q. Page 3.
A. Page 3.
Q. "Insurmountable."
A. "Insurmountable." Thank you.
Q. I'll prompt the witness here.
A. "Insurmountable." Line 6, page 3.
Q. Page 3, line 6, the word "insurmountable," correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you have any other changes or
corrections to your testimony?
A. I do not.
Q. Did you prepare a summary of your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you read that into the record, please?
A. Okay. I am senior vice president, east operations for Corix, and I oversee the operations of Carolina Water Service, Inc. of North Carolina; Blue Granite Water Company in South Carolina; and Sunshine Water Service in Florida, all of which are subsidiaries of Corix Regulated Utilities. In addition, I serve as president of Carolina Water Service, North Carolina and Blue Granite Water Company.

I hold a bachelor of aerospace engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology, as well as an executive master's in business administration from Queens University in Charlotte, North Carolina.

I've worked in the utility sector for over 24 years in multiple capacities, ranging from engineering to strategic planning and major project execution.

My testimony explains the object and purposes of this application and addresses how multiple aspects of the public interest are served by Carolina Water Service's acquisition of the Carteret County water
system. The purpose of the filing is to comply with the statutory and rule-based requirements for determining the rate base value of a governmental utility when it is being acquired by a regulated public utility by use of the fair value based methodology rather than use of the original cost method.

I specifically address the nature of Carolina Water Service's and Carteret County's compliance with and reliance on the provisions of General Statute §62-133-1A [sic] to determine rate base in instances in which a regulated utility purchases a qualifying governmental utility. In addressing our compliance with the statute, I emphasize the extent to which the General Assembly has made certain policy decision as it purposefully and clearly authorized a market-based alternative to the historical original cost determination of rate base.

Finally, I'll also discuss customer safeguards and operational benefits.

MS. SANFORD: Commissioner Hughes, I'll ask that this -- that his testimony be identified and entered into the record as if given orally from the stand.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Hearing no
objection, the motion is allowed. (Whereupon, the prefiled direct testimony of Donald H. Denton, III was copied into the record as if given orally from the stand.)
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## INTRODUCTION

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
A. My name is Donald H. Denton III, and my business address is 4944

Parkway Plaza Boulevard, Suite 375, Charlotte, North Carolina 28217.
Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
A. I am Senior Vice President, East Operations for Corix. I oversee the
A. operations of Carolina Water Service, Inc. of North Carolina ("CWSNC" or "Company"), Blue Granite Water Company ("BGWC") in South Carolina, and Sunshine Water Services in Florida, all of which are subsidiaries of Corix Regulated Utilities ("CRU"). In addition, I serve as President of CWSNC and BGWC.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND.
A. I hold a Bachelor of Aerospace Engineering from The Georgia Institute of Technology as well as an Executive Masters in Business Administration from Queens University in Charlotte, North Carolina. I have worked in the utility sector for over 24 years in multiple capacities ranging from engineering to strategic planning and major project execution.
Q. WHAT ARE YOUR DUTIES AS PRESIDENT OF CAROLINA WATER SERVICE, INC. OF NORTH CAROLINA?
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A. I am responsible for the Company's regulated water and sewer operations in North Carolina, including facility operations, finance, business development, safety, compliance, regulatory affairs, and customer service.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
A. My testimony explains the object and purpose of this Application and addresses how the public interest is served by the acquisition by CWSNC of the Carteret County Water System. This is specifically responsive to Commission Rule R7-41(d), which reads in pertinent part:

In addition to providing the information required pursuant to G.S. $62-133.1 \mathrm{~A}$ in the completed application form, the application shall contain a narrative explanation of the object and purposes desired by the application and how the public interest is served by the acquisition, along with any other information required by the Commission. The application shall be accompanied by the testimony of the acquiring utility's president or another person employed by the utility who is personally familiar with the contents thereof and who verifies that the contents of the application are true and accurate.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OBJECT AND PURPOSE OF THIS

 APPLICATION.A. The purpose of the filing is to comply with the statutory and rule-based requirements for determining the rate base value of a governmental utility, when it is being acquired by a regulated public utility, by use of a "fair value" based methodology, rather than by use of the "original cost" method. Specifically, CWSNC wishes to purchase the Carteret County Water
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System. In order to make the transaction feasible, the "fair value" methodology must be employed in order to capture the reasonable, realistic value of this system as it migrates from ownership by a governmental entity to ownership by a utility regulated by the North Carolina Utilities Commission ("NCUC" or "Commission"). Absent the ability to establish a realistic level of "market" value of such assets, there is an insurmountable obstacle to purchases of governmental systems by utilities that are regulated under Chapter 62 of the General Statutes. If limited, for rate base purposes, to recognition only of the original cost of the Carteret County Water System, CWSNC could not justify as prudent a purchase price that would reflect a fair, reasonable, or realistic value for the asset. CWSNC is eager to effectively use this new statutory tool to enter municipal, county, and other governmental markets, and is pleased to bring this case of first impression in the use of N.C.G.S. § 62-133.1A.
Q. HOW IS THE PUBLIC INTEREST SERVED BY THE USE OF N.C.G.S. § 62-133.1A TO FACILITATE TRANSFERS OF OWNERSHIP BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL UTILITY PROVIDERS AND REGULATED PUBLIC UTILITIES?
A. The "Fair Value" Statute (N.C.G.S. § 62-133.1A) was carefully developed by the legislature and was thoughtfully implemented in the subsequent regulatory rulemaking proceeding before the Commission (NCUC Docket
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No. W-100 Sub 60). The statute established a mechanism by which willing sellers of governmental water and wastewater systems and willing buyers in the regulated public utility sector could overcome a primary barrier to sale that has historically hindered transfers that could be squarely in the public interest. This historical barrier has consisted of an inability to correlate fair purchase prices with the rate base values of the asset to the regulated utility. This method, referred to herein as the "Fair Value" mechanism, combines independent business evaluations by the governmental providers, prudent decisions by the regulated public utilities, participation on behalf of customers by the Public Staff, valuations by qualified appraisers, and comprehensive regulatory oversight by the Commission.

In the event that a governmental unit determines that its water (or wastewater) service can be provided in a more reliable, economical, efficient, and/or compliant way by a regulated public utility, it can be in the public interest of its customers and community to sell the system. Similarly, if a regulated public utility can increase its economies of scale, allocate its overhead more efficiently, grow its systems and revenues, and/or strengthen its internal capacities by purchasing a governmental utility at reasonable cost, then that too can serve the public interest. More specific discussion of the application of those principles to the facts of this case follows.
Q. HOW IS THE PUBLIC INTEREST SERVED BY THIS ACQUISITION?
A. The purpose of this Application is to facilitate the transfer of Carteret County's water system assets to CWSNC at fair value, and to reflect that value in the calculation of rate base. The purpose of this testimony is to explain how this transfer of ownership is in the public interest of the customers of both Carteret County and CWSNC. N.C.G.S. § 62-133.1A provides a path through which the interests of all customers can be advanced and safeguarded, the benefits of expanded rate base and economies of scale on the CWSNC system can be realized, and the expertise contained in CWSNC's multi-state, professional, experienced organization can be extended to the various governmental systems to support the provision of safe and reliable service to customers.

This purchase, the first undertaken under N.C.G.S. § $62-133.1 \mathrm{~A}$, is a watershed launch of the supervised development of deliberate convergence between portions of the public and private provider markets in North Carolina. The statutory and regulatory safeguards in place will ensure protection for consumers in both markets.

## Q. ARE THERE SPECIFIC PROTECTIONS FOR CUSTOMERS OF THE

 COMBINED SYSTEMS?A. Yes. CWSNC emphasizes, in support of this filing, that the "Fair Value" statute is replete with tools whereby the Commission can
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protect ratepayers and maintain the public interest. The NCUC retains the authority to set rates for the acquired system in future rate cases, has the discretion to classify the acquired system as a separate rate entity in future rate cases, and has the authority to adjust the "fair value" as the Commission deems appropriate and in the public interest.
Q. CAN YOU DESCRIBE SOME SPECIFIC OPERATIONAL BENEFITS THAT FLOW FROM THIS ACQUISITION?
A. Yes. CWSNC contends that allowing a "fair value" method as a component of the determination of rate base for property purchased by a public utility from a governmental-owned system will realize many operational benefits. The transfer of ownership facilitated by N.C.G.S. § 62--133.1A will provide an opportunity for Carteret County and its existing customers to benefit from CWSNC's operational service expertise. Given the size and scope of the CWSNC organization, it is equipped to consistently achieve a high degree of compliance with health and environmental standards, is able to achieve efficiencies in procedures due to the advantages in economies of scale, can shift resources among systems as needed, and has a proven record as a reliable service provider. CWSNC specializes in water industry operations with a primary focus on small and medium-sized communities and is able to perform support functions such as management, billing, collections, and customer service through existing, consolidated resources.
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CWSNC has a strong local presence in the Carteret County area, with a highly qualified work force to provide an optimal level of service through enhanced efficiency and depth of experience. We plan on operational continuity by looking to maintain existing operational support. Carteret County and its customers will benefit from CWSNC's access to financial capital, which is used to ensure that necessary and prudent investments are made on a timely basis, in order to provide safe, reliable, and compliant service.

CWSNC's ability to attract capital to fund investment in infrastructure will benefit the operation of the Carteret County system in other ways. The County's operating expenses have exceeded water service revenues in recent years and the deficits have been subsidized by tax revenues generated from supplemental taxes. CWSNC's ownership will provide the financial and operational resources needed to manage Carteret County's water system efficiently and safely.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE ACQUISITION BENEFITS CWSNC'S EXISTING CUSTOMERS.

A. CWSNC's existing customers will also realize benefits from the acquisition of Carteret County's utility system. The additional customers gained by this transfer will provide economies of scale by spreading existing fixed costs over a larger customer base. Carteret County and CWSNC's customers
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will also experience the advantages of operating within a uniform group of ratepayers which includes smoother rate adjustments, regulatory and operational cost efficiencies, and shared access to support for vital capital needs.
Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
A. Yes.


MR. GRANTMYRE: I would ask for
clarification. Are you introducing his direct
testimony and rebuttal or just direct?
MS. SANFORD: No, his direct.
MR. GRANTMYRE: Okay. So rebuttal will
come the later.
MS. SANFORD: Correct.
MR. GRANTMYRE: So I could save my good questions for later.

MS. SANFORD: Please do.
MR. GRANTMYRE: Okay.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. GRANTMYRE:
Q. Mr. Denton, if $I$ offend you in any way today, I'm sorry, because I really like you and I think you're doing a good job.
A. Thank you, Mr. Grantmyre, I appreciate that.
Q. We'll clarify that.

Now, isn't it true that Carolina Water and Aqua North Carolina joined together to hire a lobbyist to seek North Carolina representatives in the General Assembly to introduce a fair market value bill? Is that correct?
A. Can you clarify "together," because, quite frankly, Mr. Grantmyre, I was not a party to the

Company. I was not with the Company at that time. Q. Okay.

MS. SANFORD: I'm gonna object. I'm gonna go ahead and roll out a relevance objection here. I'm not sure that I understand what that has to do with the proceeding before the Commission, which concerns an adopted statute.

MR. GRANTMYRE: If she would hear the next couple of questions, then she would see the relevance.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Objection overruled.

MR. GRANTMYRE: Chair Hughes, I would ask that Public Staff Denton Direct Cross Exhibit 1 be identified. This is the one that has the General Assembly, and the numbers may be wrong. When I got my copy, it said 2, but it's supposed to be 1. It's the one that has the history of the General Assembly, and then it has the two copies of the draft bill -- that is a draft bill -- and then the final. But $I$ ask that be identified as Cross Examination Exhibit 1.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: The way they were given to us is they were collated and stapled. So
do you want us to -- is it the entire document that you're requesting?

MR. GRANTMYRE: It's this thing
(indicating).
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. And --
(Discussion off record.)
MR. DROOZ: Commissioners, just for the benefit of the court reporter and the other parties, could we maybe clarify on the record exactly what's here?

MR. GRANTMYRE: I would clarify that it's the exhibit that has on the top House Bill 351, and the first page or last page, it was supposed to be first, has the legislative history.

MR. DROOZ: And how many pages, in total?

MR. GRANTMYRE: I think it's eight.
MR. CREECH: Correct.
MR. GRANTMYRE: That's pretty high math.
MR. DROOZ: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Mr. Drooz, is that sufficient? You're okay?

MR. DROOZ: Yes, thank you. I'm on board now.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And very good school.

You didn't take legislative courses there, did you?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. Now, on page 3 of this exhibit -COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Just to be clear, could you clarify it rather than use page numbers.
Q. I'm sorry. It's the one that has on the top HB 351 on the top right-hand corner, March 14, 2017, in the little box.

Now, I show you this page, I think it's the third page on the exhibit, and will you accept, subject to check, that this is the copy of the bill originally introduced in the House by the two sponsors?
A. Subject to check.
Q. And if you go to the third page back, and
again, it says Session 219 -- 217 at the top, in paragraph E, Commission's authority to set rates, could you read that into the record.
A. "Commission's authority to set rates. The Commission shall retain its authority, under Chapter 62 of the General Statutes, to set rates for the acquired system in future rate cases consistent with the public interest."
Q. Now, I go -- if you would go to the next page, and it has at the top Session Law 2018-51 House Bill 51 -- I'm sorry, 351.
A. Okay.

MS. SANFORD: May I ask what page we're on? I'm losing track.

MR. GRANTMYRE: I'm sorry it wasn't -all the pages weren't numbered. It would be page 6.

MS. SANFORD: 6. Okay. Thank you.
MR. GRANTMYRE: Unnumbered.
MS. SANFORD: Okay.
MR. GRANTMYRE: Next time it will be numbered.

COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: Mr. Grantmyre, just for clarification, the exhibit that everyone
else has received has the statute, the House Bill 351 is the first page. And so what you're referring to page 6 is actually page 4 of our exhibit, and it's --

MR. GRANTMYRE: I'm sorry. This is the first two pages.

MR. CREECH: What we would like to do, if we may, the document that was distributed had the bill history at the back of it. And what we'd like to do is place that in the front. And so the bill history would be the first two pages, and then we've got the bill as introduced, and then the bill as passed. And those are the three things that make up this document.

So again, the first two pages are the bill summary, the next three pages is the bill as introduced, and then the final three pages are the bill as passed. If that helps. I don't know if it helps.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: It helps.
MR. CREECH: And thank you.
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Thank you for that.
Q. Now, will you accept subject to check, on the
last page, it says that the same is hereby declared to become law on June of $25,2018$.

Do you see that right above Karen Jenkins, enrolling clerk's name?
A. I see that.
Q. Now, going back to paragraph -- throughout your testimony and your rebuttal, you talk about how thoroughly the legislature studied this bill and how they approved it; isn't that correct?
A. Well, I talk about the efforts that were put forth by the Companies and that the legislature passed the bill.
Q. Well, you also talk about how thoroughly they -- carefully they studied the bill and passed it; is that correct?
A. Can I ask the question of counsel, as you were saying thoroughly, can you define thoroughly?
Q. Okay. Carefully. I'll use the word carefully.

MS. SANFORD: Excuse me, objection, if I might, to ask Mr. Grantmyre if he could refer us to the page of the testimony, that might help.

MR. GRANTMYRE: My work copy got lost,
and all I have is a clean copy. But I would
contend he says that several times in his direct testimony and at least once or twice in his rebuttal testimony.

MR. CREECH: If I may -- Mr. Denton, I could -- if I may, page 5 of the direct testimony.
Q. Okay. It's on page 3, line 19:
"The fair value statute was carefully
developed by the legislature and was
thoughtfully implemented in the supplement regulatory proceeding before the Commission." That relates to the setting rules.
A. Okay.
Q. Now, going back to this Exhibit 1, on the very last page, you see subparagraph (e), Commission's authority. The name of the paragraph has been changed. But if you would read into the record -- and do you agree that last sentence was not in the original bill as introduced? If you could read the last sentence into the record, please.
A. The last sentence of (e)?
Q. Yeah, where it begins with "if the Commission finds."
A. "If the Commission finds that the average of the appraisals will not result in a
reasonable fair value, the Commission may
adjust the fair value as it deems appropriate and in the public interest."
Q. Now, could we agree that the legislature's careful study of this bill, by them inserting that sentence into the bill, that they wanted the Commission to have discretion if they feel the appraisers -appraisals are not a reasonable fair value?
A. The language was added to the legislation. I'm not sure --
Q. That was added by the legislature. So could we agree that, if they did not want it in the statute, that they would not have inserted that sentence?
A. I can agree to that.
Q. Now, is it Carolina Water's position that the Commission should not have that discretion?
A. No.
Q. I'm sorry, they made me write out my questions.
A. That's quite all right.
Q. Forty-five years, I've never written out a question. By the way, that was the relevancy. Now, on page 3, line 6 of your direct testimony, you make a
statement, and you've taken out "insurmountable"; but still the way it reads now, there is an obstacle to purchases of government systems by utilities that are regulated under Chapter 62 of the General Statutes.

Are you aware that the Commission has approved acquisition adjustments for the acquisitions of water and/or sewer utility systems?
A. I'm aware.
Q. And are you aware that, at one time, Utilities, Inc. was the parent Company of Carolina Water?
A. I'm aware.
Q. And have you had the opportunity, since you came to Carolina Water -- I know it's just recently -to read the Commission's order approving transfer and denying acquisition adjustment in the transfer of the sewer utility system for North Topsail Island, which was transferred to Utilities, Inc., being Docket Number W-1000, Sub 5, order dated January 6, 2000?
A. I haven't read the entire order, but I've read some summaries of it.
Q. Did you read the portions that dealt with acquisition adjustment, whereby -- did you read that part?
A. I read parts of it.
Q. And you realize that was the full Commission hearing the case, except one very able Commissioner by the name of Sanford recused herself, and one other Commissioner. So it was five of the seven.
A. (No response.)
Q. Now, in that case, the Commission changed the
requirements for approval of acquisition adjustments;
are you aware of that?
A. I'm aware of that.
Q. And in that case, on page 22, in the middle of the page, there's a headline or heading that says:
"The benefits of Utility, Inc.'s ownership do not outweigh the costs of including the purchase price in rate base." You've read that?
A. It's in the summary. Not word-for-word, but --
Q. Okay. And you're aware that Utilities, Inc. appealed the decision to the North Carolina Court of Appeals and they were unsuccessful in the Court of Appeals; are you aware of that?
A. I was not aware of that, but you've now told me.
Q. Okay. Now, I'm gonna read a section -- your attorney could help you know who wrote this opinion, but this has Jimmy Irvin written all over it, in my opinion, anyway. It states:
"After examining the relevant policy considerations and prior decisions of the Commission, the Commission concludes that the outcome in an acquisition adjustment case should hinge upon whether the parties seeking rate base treatment for an acquisition adjustment has established by the greater weight of the evidence that the purchase price the purchaser has agreed to is prudent, and the benefits of including the acquisition in rate base outweigh any resulting burden to ratepayers?"

Now, why couldn't, instead of going on to this statute, Carolina Water simply apply for an acquisition adjustment?
A. Well, the statute's been made available. The Commission created a rule based on the statute. So we made the choice to pursue the statute for fair value.
Q. How does a 9.5 purchase price in your contract benefit the customers on the system and
outweigh the increased cost to the customers to pay for the $\$ 9.5$ million plus the closing costs in rate base?
A. Well, I would argue the fact that it actually costs more to the customer base. I don't agree with that premise.
Q. Excuse me, could you repeat that?
A. I don't agree with the premise that it costs more for the customer base, based on how we set up the structure of the contract, that -- and the County can talk to the current customers of the county and the residents within the county more effectively than $I$ can. But if the County had to cover the cost of that system today, they would have to raise rates.
Q. Yeah. The Public Staff does not deny that, and you'll see that in Mr. Junis' exhibit.

So your answer is, the statute was available and you didn't think it was necessary to prove that the benefits to the customers outweigh the increased cost?
A. The statute's available, right? And so we've chosen to use this statute. It was created along with other legislation that's recently been passed in North Carolina, which, quite frankly, has enabled the opportunity for future consolidation and the ability for us to move forward with acquisitions of this type.
Q. Now, this will not be a consolidation, as far as interconnecting the system; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And your closest system is Brandywine Bay, which is water and wastewater, and is three or four miles away; isn't that correct?
A. We have Brandywine Bay, Hestron Park, Spooners Creek, Fairfield Harbor, Carolina Pines are all in the same region and would be run from the same area manager.
Q. Okay. But as far as -- as far as the interconnection, Fairfield Harbor is across the river from New Bern, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Okay. We're gonna move on from that to another thing. I know you hope I'm running out of questions, but I got a few more.
A. I figured you might.
Q. Do you agree, as shown in Mr. Junis' testimony, that there are 1,277 customers on this water system and 55 miles of water main?
A. Approximate, subject to check, but yes.
Q. Okay. Do you agree that the density of customers on this Carteret system, the density of
customers to water mains is extremely low?
A. I would agree with that.
Q. Do you agree that Carolina Water is responsible -- if they had closed the transaction, would be responsible for the repair or replacement of the water mains in areas where there are no customers?
A. I understand that.

MR. GRANTMYRE: Chair Hughes, I would request that Public Staff Denton Direct Cross Exhibit Number 2, which is a map and is two pages, be identified.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: It shall be so marked Public Staff Denton Direct Cross Exhibit Number 2.
(Public Staff Denton Cross Examination
Exhibit Number 2 was marked for
identification.)
Q. Mr. Denton, I assume you've seen these two maps before?
A. I have.
Q. And I assume you rode the system at one time or another?
A. I have driven the system.
Q. And do you agree that there are much -- I'll
tell you, magnetic north is to the top, and the line or water mains on the east side of the bay right at the bottom, I'd call that a main running north.

Now, do you agree that there are much fewer customers on that side of the main -- that portion of the main, than there are on the bay side or the west side?
A. Well, the map as shown doesn't actually show customers.
Q. I know that. But you may not have been counting as you were riding around, but the Public Staff did ride around looking for customers. Okay.

Now, we -- at the top of the map, there is a line running east/west or straight across; do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And would you agree that, on that portion of the mine -- main, there are very, very few customers, and to the north side and east side of that portion, it is primarily open fields?
A. Mr. Grantmyre, I apologize, I don't know -- I wasn't counting houses when $I$ was driving around.
Q. Okay. Now, would it help if we showed one of Chuck video -- Chuck Junis' videos for you? I'm just
teasing. Okay.
Now, as you turn north, as you see at the very left-hand side of this, or the west side, you see a line going up, a main going up which you and I could agree runs to Craven County; is that correct?
A. In that direction.
Q. Now, isn't it your recollection that there were no -- almost no customers on that section of main?
A. Again, Mr. Grantmyre, I don't know exactly which roads $I$ was going up and down. I don't even know that I went up this road where this line is buried.
Q. Okay. Now, isn't it -- and I understand one purpose of that line is so that you could get purchased water from Craven County, or the County can?
A. That's my understanding as well. It's emergency backup.
Q. Do you know whether they have ever gotten water from Craven County?
A. I do not know.
Q. Now, is it your understanding that they also have an emergency backup from the Town of Beaufort?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And it is interconnected?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Now, recently you filed something with the Public Staff whereby you're gonna install a 12-inch water main to get purchased water from the Town of Mooresville, and the estimated construction cost was -and it was a mile in length -- was over $\$ 3$ million; do you remember that?
A. Subject to check on the numbers. We are installing a line for the interconnect at Mooresville, yes.
Q. Okay. And at the bottom left, it has a scale, and I can't tell from the scale how long that main going to Craven County is, but would you agree it's approximately a mile?
A. Approximately.
Q. And would it be reasonable and prudent for a main to be constructed where there are very, very few customers in the future and you've already got a second water source?
A. It depends on the system and design. I have not studied the engineer report on distribution in this system, but I would assume that that would play into the hydraulics within the system.
Q. But the system has three booster stations, doesn't it?
A. It does.
Q. And it has three elevated storage tanks?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And pressure on the system comes from the elevated storage tanks and the booster stations, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I do a lot better without written questions. Wouldn't the water in that north mile or whatever it is going to Craven County, if there are no customers or hardly any customers with little or no flow, wouldn't that create issues with the Safe Drinking Water Act and the public water supply, PWSS, rules on trihalomethanes and haloacetic acids?
A. Not necessarily, depending on how the system was operated.
Q. Well, part of the operations -- you're not a licensed water operator, are you?
A. I am not.
Q. Would you be surprised to learn that I am or was?
A. I know you were.
Q. And every time I go to continuing education, which was required, the speakers would say that one way
you deal with trihalomethanes and haloacetic acid is to make sure you flush the mains prior to taking the samples. Are you aware of that?
A. I've heard that.
Q. And is that Carolina Water's policy?
A. Well, we prefer to have a loop system.
Q. I know, but here you got a dead end.
A. That's right.
Q. And for better or worse, you got a dead end at the south end -- well, not necessarily. Somewhere you connect to the Town of Beaufort at the south -- at the southeast portion of the map.
A. The map.
Q. Now, if you were flushing water, a lot of water, because that -- that main looks to be a fairly large main.

It's certainly not a 2-inch main; could we agree with that?
A. I would agree with that.
Q. Now, do you agree that the water used to flush would be treated potable water, which is basically flushed to waste?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you agree that Carolina Water would
have to pay to treat and pump that wasted water, thereby increasing operating costs?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, wouldn't you agree that, with large stretches of mains in lower, without customers, that you have to do flushing -- that that lowers the value of a system, because you're increasing your operating expenses and it's going to waste?
A. Well, I don't know that it would lower the value of the system. I'd say that it's an increased cost.
Q. Well, systems that increase your costs that don't provide benefits for the increased cost, or wasted expenses, you're saying that doesn't lower the value of the system?
A. It may not.
Q. Okay. Does Carolina Water have water systems in North Carolina -- I won't go to South Carolina, I used to practice down there -- have such low density of customers to water mains as this system?
A. We have varied density systems. I don't know if we have any that are as low as this, but we have low -- fairly low density in a number of systems.
Q. On those that you have low density, isn't it
true that the developer installed, at his cost, the water mains, and Carolina Water was not paying to install the mains in the low-density areas?
A. Well, some systems were acquired, and when -we didn't work directly with developers on some systems.
Q. But is it your testimony that Carolina Water would not extend water mains, particularly of large-diameter water mains, where there would be a very low density of customers?
A. Not necessarily. I'm not saying that. I'm saying that it's based on design premise and need.
Q. But these are dead-end mains.

Would you extend large dead-end mains where there's gonna be a low density?
A. I'm not the engineer of record.
Q. Okay. We're gonna switch to elevated storage now.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you agree there are three elevated water storage tanks on the Carteret County system, each 200,000 gallons, for a total of 600,000 gallons of elevated storage?
A. Yes.
Q. Does Carolina Water have any North Carolina water systems with 600-gallon -- 600,000 gallons of elevated storage and only 1,277 customers?
A. I'd have to check.
Q. Okay. I realize you've only been here a couple of years, and in my opinion, you're doing a great job, so.
A. Thank you.
Q. Do you agree that each of these three elevated water storage tanks must be maintained by the owner, including periodic recoating of the interiors and exteriors, which would include extensive surface preparation?
A. Yes.
Q. And the County had a contract with, I believe, Southern Corrosion, and that contract called for the interiors to be recoated every 15 years; is that correct?
A. Subject to check.
Q. Okay. Now, do you agree that the cost to recoat the interior and exterior of one of these elevated water storage tanks will appreciably exceed \$100,000?
A. I would anticipate it would.
Q. And when we say recoat, and particularly on the inside, will you agree that they must do a -sandblast the inside to remove all rust, and then recoat it with a coating such as epoxy?
A. (No response.)
Q. If you haven't --
A. I haven't dealt specifically with that, but if -- I could see that as a possibility. I don't know for sure.
Q. And if they were inside the tank doing the sandblasting and the recoating with epoxy or whatever coating, would you agree, being inside the tank, that would be a confined space?
A. Yes.
Q. And there would be an additional cost in the inside to comply with the confined space rules. Would you agree with that?
A. I would.
Q. So does the fact there were three water storage tanks rather than only two tanks of 300,000 gallons each, doesn't that increase the cost of maintenance of these tanks in operating the water system?
A. For the entire system, I would say based on
the premise, the hypothetical, yes.
Q. And again, you would not agree that that lowers the value of the system because you've got increased costs because of what may have been engineering design that --
A. Can you repeat the question? I'm not sure I understand the question.
Q. I made that question up and it's not my notes, so we'll skip that. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. Would you be surprised in the future, in a future rate case, if the Public Staff were to recommend an adjustment to the Commission for overbuilt plant as far as the water mains and the elevated storage tanks? I didn't ask did you agree, I'm asking would you be surprised.
A. No. And I want to qualify that. I think that we would want to and would need to make sure that -- and the engineer of record designed this facility, these facilities, right? These are designed by an engineer. And so I would go by the engineer's --
Q. Okay. But you have -- Carolina Water has been dealing in the water business in North Carolina with utilities since the 1960s or '70s, haven't you?
A. Carolina Water as other companies, previous companies to Carolina Water, yes.
Q. Yeah. Actually the name was Carolina Water, I think, in the '70s.

And, now, if three tanks were put in, elevated tanks, and extended water mains where there are very few customers, isn't that a growth assumption? And in the cases before this Commission, the risk on extensions of systems based on future growth has been put on the Company if the Company pays those costs.

Are you aware of those decisions?
A. I don't accept the premise, no.
Q. Okay. So -- okay. We're gonna move to the Merrimon system now, which is page 2 of this exhibit.

Have you visited this system?
A. I did not visit this system.
Q. Okay. It comes to my next question.

Is the reason you didn't visit the system because it's 20 miles away from the other system?
A. No. It wouldn't have been the reason.
Q. But would you agree it is 19 or 20 miles? I think one of the reports said it was 19 miles.
A. Approximately.
Q. And that it is over a country -- small
country road?
A. Yes.
Q. And -- and would you agree that, you know, you have the well over there and the pump house to the east side of the system; do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And then most of the customers are on the line, the main that runs in a southwest -- assuming north is at the top of this, in a southwest direction?
A. Yes.
Q. And that is another dead end; isn't that true?
A. It appears to be on the map.
Q. And would you accept, subject to check, that this was the map given to us by Carolina Water or the County or both?
A. Subject to check.
Q. And again, isn't it necessary to flush dead-end lines before water sampling in order to get fresh water in there?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it true that a -- and there's only about 20 customers on this system; is that correct?
A. I think it's a little more than 20 , but.
Q. Okay. Isn't it -- if it was only 20 , isn't it true that a water system with only 20 customers that -- that is remote 20 miles away is not a very attractive purchase option?
A. I would not agree with that, necessarily.
Q. So the next time the Public Staff has a remote system with only 20 customers, we should call y'all and lead you to jump on it?
A. We would evaluate it.
Q. Okay. Very good. Now, isn't it true that this system -- isn't it true that Carolina Water's operator, whether it be the operator in responsible charge or another employee, would need to visit this system in the well house at least once -- weekly in order to check on the water treatment?
A. We would -- we would need to do the well checks, yes.
Q. And isn't it weekly you check, or how often do you check? You don't have equipment in the -you're not gonna put equipment in this well house or treatment house that designates to Carolina Water, by radio or whatever means, water quality day in day out?
A. We actually -- I do not know what SCADA or if there is SCADA in this particular well house, but we
are currently implementing a statewide plan that is -we're working with DEQ on to minimize the number of daily well checks and maximize operator time for other things.
Q. And you agree, for him to drive that 20 miles to visit the well house, that that would be an expense borne by the Company, wear and tear on the truck, mileage, him having this windshield time?
A. Absolutely not unlike any of the other systems we have statewide. We are very remote and we have a lot of windshield time.
Q. Okay. But isn't it true that it's not economical to operate a water system that is remote for only 20 customers, if that's the number?
A. Somebody has to do it.
Q. Well, isn't it true that you have to perform all the Safe Drinking Water Act water tests on this system that you would perform on a system with 2- or 300 customers?
A. Same standard.
Q. So the cost per customers for water testing would be much higher?
A. Well, the testing, itself, on a per test is the same.
Q. Well, divided by the number of customers?
A. Customers, yeah.
Q. Okay. On page 3 of your testimony -- direct testimony, lines 5 -- I think we already covered that. Okay. Okay.

On page 3, line 8 , or somewhere on that page, you say that Carolina must justify a purchase price as prudent; isn't that correct?
A. That's what it says, yes, we could not justify it as prudent.
Q. And if the Commission was looking at the -whether or not to approve rate base, shouldn't they look at whether a purchase price is prudent?
A. From what perspective?
Q. In the Commissioner's discretion.
A. That is the prerogative of the Commission.
Q. Now, wasn't -- isn't it true, or do you agree that Carolina Water's original offer of the system was $\$ 4.9$ million, don't you agree that that was a prudent purchase price?
A. The $\$ 4.9$ million was an initial bid in an upset bid process.
Q. But if, in fact, 4 point -- why did you make the bid of 4.9 if it wasn't prudent?
A. I wanted to know what Aqua was gonna bid.
Q. So the competition of one better than Aqua got involved in this?
A. We were one -- we knew we were gonna be below Aqua.
Q. Now, assuming for the sake of argument that $\$ 4.9$ million offer was prudent, certainly you wouldn't make an offer to the County that was not prudent, would you?
A. I don't understand the question.
Q. Okay. I'll back up. Assuming \$4.9 million offer, your first offer, was prudent, how does $\$ 9.5$ million, which is more than double, or almost double, how is that prudent, other than beating out Aqua?
A. Well, the -- we knew what the initial valuation was by the engineer of the system -- systems, plural. And the 4.9 was an initial volley. We knew that was not gonna be the end point of the upset bid process.
Q. Now, when you say the valuation by -- the initial valuation by the engineer, is that the same engineer who designed the system to run all the way to Craven County where no customers on the way and install
three elevated storage tanks, whereby probably two would be sufficient?
A. I have no idea who the initial engineer of record was.
Q. Okay. Now, you're aware that Carteret County offered the water system to Beaufort in March of 2020, are you not?
A. I am aware.
Q. And the offer, I'll get you the exact amount, was a little bit over $\$ 2$ million assumption of debt, much of which had an interest rate of 2.205 percent; you're aware of that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're aware that Beaufort, the Town of Beaufort, as we said earlier, is already interconnected and is right next door to this system, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're aware that Beaufort declined to purchase it?
A. Yes.
Q. And if they -- if it was turned down at a little over $\$ 2$ million, how is a $\$ 9.5$ million purchase price prudent?
A. I can't speak to the reasons why Beaufort
decided not to pursue this.
Q. But you would agree that Beaufort should have knowledge of the system being next door?
A. I have no idea of what Beaufort knows and what they don't know.
Q. Now, your water operators talk to neighboring water operators of other utilities and cities or counties, do they not?
A. I would expect they do. I don't know.
Q. Okay. So there is a possibility that the Carteret County water operators periodically have discussions with the Beaufort operators?
A. Hypothetically, it's possible.
Q. Now, on page 4, lines 13 and 14 of your testimony, you discuss that Carolina Water would be more reliable, economical, efficient, and/or compliant, have more compliant water service, would be provided by a regulated public utility; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. What evidence is there that Carteret County operations were not reliable?
A. I would say that it's not that it's not reliable, but we have -- this is core to our business. This is our business. We do it 100 percent within the
regulated business of Corix. Carolina Water Service is water and wastewater statewide. And so to say that it's more reliable doesn't mean that what they're doing is not reliable. It means that we have more reliable, more opportunity from the standpoint of efficiency, and again, the compliance work that we do nationwide.

And we're able to pull in resources from other jurisdictions, other areas. Great example was the freeze in Texas. We had people from Alaska fly down to Texas to help out during the freeze. And so we've got depth of resources, very diverse depth of resources.
Q. Now, will Alaska be part of the transfer or merger with Southwest Water? Or you're not sure? If you're not sure --
A. No, I'm sure. I just don't understand the relevancy of the question.
Q. Okay. Because you're not gonna have Alaska --
A. We will. Alaska will be a part of the merger.
Q. Okay. Now, you say it would be more economical.
Isn't it true that the Carteret County cost
of debt is much lower -- and we'll get to this later -than Carolina Water's imbedded debt cost in your current rate case is 4.64 percent imbedded cost rate?
A. The -- Carteret County's is lower.
Q. Okay. And as far as being efficient, Carteret County has its operators living right there, just as utilities -- Carolina Water would have operators living nearby. So it's not more efficient because an operator going to the treatment house is basically the same, assuming the same quality of operators.

Would you agree with that?
A. I would agree with that.
Q. And you would agree that Carteret County has been fully compliant with the DENR rules and the Safe Drinking Water Act, and they've had no notices of violation?
A. Was that a question? I'm sorry, you're asking if $I$ know that?
Q. Yes. Are you aware of that?
A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
Q. And do you agree?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Okay. And on your direct testimony, on
page 5, line 9, you talk about the benefits of expanded rate base and economies of scale.

How does an expanded rate base benefit the customers on the system?
A. Well, it's the entire system, so you're looking at all of Carolina Water Service uniform rate customers. We're looking at spreading fixed costs over a larger base. And so that's a 4.5 percent -- if you look at the uniform base, 4.5 percent additional water customers.
Q. But you would agree that the $\$ 9.5$ million purchase price plus closing costs divided by the 1,273 customers would yield a substantially higher original cost of rate base per customer than is on the Carolina Water uniform rates in North Carolina, would you not?
A. That calculation is higher.
Q. It's higher?

So that would put upward pressure on or increase -- tend to increase the rates of the other Carolina Water customers if it ever goes into uniform rates?
A. I disagree with that premise.
Q. Okay. Just the return on rate base factor. Do you agree that on a return on rate base,
you get your imbedded debt cost, which would be 6.4 percent; is that correct?
A. Subject to check.
Q. And your current Utility Commission decisions have your capital structure at about 50/50; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your last rate case, your approved ROE was 9.4 percent?
A. That's correct.
Q. And, of course, the ROE must be grossed up for income taxes, correct? So the revenue requirement piece would be higher than the 9.4 , as far as that 50 percent that's dedicated to equity or supplied by equity; is that correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Now, in your testimony, on page 5, line 10 of your direct testimony, you discuss the benefits of economies of scale. But Carolina Water never quantifies those so-called economies of scale.

Now, if Carolina Water can file a multiyear three-year rate case, why couldn't Carolina Water quantify the benefits of the economies of scale?
A. Well, there would be plenty of assumptions
that went into it, but we didn't do it in this case.
Q. Now, Public Staff accounting supervisor, Lynn Feasel filed an affidavit in October, the same date Chuck Junis' testimony was filed, where she quantified the revenue requirement impact for the \$9.5 million purchase price in rate base and the increase in the revenue requirement for the return on rate base, including debt and equity and depreciation. And in that first year, her number was $\$ 1.18$ million. Do you agree that she filed that?
A. Subject to check on the numbers.
Q. Do you agree that Carolina Water never contested in its rebuttal testimony that calculation of \$1.18 million revenue requirement increase? Do you agree with that?
A. Subject to check. But I agree that I don't believe we did.
Q. Now, earlier I asked you about nearby water systems.

Do you agree the only large water system Carolina Water has in Carteret County is Brandywine Bay, which is that one 3 or 4 miles away?
A. That's the largest, yeah, I believe.
Q. And you agree that the application at this
time, Carolina Water has no plans to interconnect
Brandywine water system with the soon -- with the to be acquired Carteret County water system?
A. As of right now, we do not.
Q. Now, on page 7, line 6 of your direct testimony, you state that the customers on the system will benefit from Carolina Water's financial capital; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And as I asked you earlier, you agree, in Carolina Water's pending rate case, the imbedded cost of debt for Carolina Water is 4.64 percent?
A. I believe that's correct, subject to check.

MR. GRANTMYRE: Chair Hughes, I now ask that Public Staff Denton Direct Cross Examination Exhibit Number 3 be identified, and it's the one that near the top says Public Staff Data Request number 10, originally dominated by Public Staff as number 11. So this one -- this one has a bunch of pages, I don't know how many. In the future, the Public Staff needs to number all the pages, and we will do so.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: It shall be so marked.
(Public Staff Denton Cross Examination Exhibit Number 3 was marked for identification.)
Q. Now, would you agree that this was a response of a data request provided to the Public Staff by Carteret County and also by Carolina Water, some of the questions towards the end?
A. It looks as if it is, yes.
Q. Now, I refer you to page 2 of this exhibit, and question number 2. Could you please read into the record the question, the second part that says, "Please provide the current amount and interest rates on the County's existing debt for the water system."
A. Okay.
"Please provide the current amount and interest rates on the County's existing debt for the water system. The County response:

State revolving fund held by NCDENR, balance $10 / 26 / 22$ is $\$ 31,032$, interest rate of 5.75 percent. State revolving fund held by NCDENR, balance $10 / 26 / 22$ of $\$ 560,000$, interest rate of 2.205 percent. And the USDA water revenue bond held by USDA, balance on $10 / 26 / 22$ of $\$ 906,000$, interest rate of 2.75
percent."
Q. Now, you will admit the bottom two interest rates are materially below the 4.64 imbedded debt cost of Carolina Water; is that correct?
A. They are below, yes.
Q. Now, I know you haven't done the calculations, but will you accept, subject to check -and I could assure you the Commission's accountants will check on any math that Bill Grantmyre does -Freda Hilburn's really tough -- that the imbedded debt cost -- the weighted and imbedded debt cost of these three outstanding loans is 2.61 percent?

Will you accept, subject to check, and you could put in your proposed order, that Grantmyre can't multiply and divide?
A. Subject to check.
Q. Now, I refer you to the next page of this exhibit. And under number 4, could you please read that question into the record.
A. "What are the County's current bond ratings with S\&P, Moody's, and Fitch." The County response: The water fund, Carteret County has not issued publicly traded debt for the water fund, therefore, Carteret County does not
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have a bond rating for the water fund. All of Carteret County's water debt is unrated. The general fund, general obligation rating, S\&P is AA plus, Fitch ratings, AA plus, and Moody's, Aa1."
Q. Does Carolina Water have a Fitch, Moody's, or S\&P credit rating?
A. No.
Q. Now, your parent company now is Corix

Regulated Utilities; is that correct?
A. The parent of Carolina Water Service is what Corix -- yeah, CRU, yes.
Q. CRU?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And does CRU or Corix Regulated Utilities have a credit rating by Fitch, Moody's, or S\&P?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Do you happen to know if Corix group of companies, who is currently your ultimate parent at this time, do you know if it has a credit rating by Fitch, Moody's, or S\&P?
A. I do not, no.
Q. Now, isn't it true that Carolina Water
long-term debt has a long-term loan of approximately 6.6 percent interest rate, and it has a make-whole provision whereby Carolina Water can not prepay that debt; is that true?
A. I do not know the answer to that. And I do not believe it's held at the Carolina Water level.
Q. But if, in fact -- if, in fact, that loan at 6.6 percent does not pay out until the year approximately 2035, would not -- would it not be true that that 6.6 percent loan would be part of Carolina Water's imbedded debt cost up until the loan is paid in approximately $2035 ?$
A. I would agree with the premise.
Q. Mr. Denton, I'm sad to say that's all my direct questions. And the good news is my rebuttal questions are much less.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Redirect?
MR. GRANTMYRE: Oh, one other question,
I'm sorry.
Q. That same exhibit, number 5, that's that 15 percent my wife was talking about.

Could you read question number 5?
A. Question number 5.
Q. On page 3.
A. (Witness peruses document.)

Back on -- okay. Back on that same exhibit.
Q. Yeah.
A. "What was the County's outstanding debt and applicable interest rates in March 2020 when the County offered to transfer the system to the Town of Beaufort? County response:

State revolving fund held by NCDENR, balance on 3/20 -- or 3/20/20 was 124" -- I assume that's "\$124,128, interest rate of 5.7 percent."
Q. Can we agree that that period after 124
should really be a comma?
A. I'd have to confirm with the county. I would assume.
Q. Okay. But on the prior page, when we talked about the balance on that loan October 2022, it was \$31,032, so --
A. Okay.
Q. -- it's certainly not $\$ 124$, we know it's incorrect?
A. That would seem incorrect.
Q. Now, if you could read the next one, state --
A. "State revolving fund held by NCDENR, balance
$3 / 20 / 20$ of $\$ 980,000$, interest rate of
2.205 percent. And USDA water revenue bond balance $3 / 20 / 20$ of $\$ 962,000$, interest rate of 2.75 percent."
Q. Now, would you agree, subject to check, that when you add those three principals up using $\$ 124,000$, that the total number of assumed debt would have been $\$ 2.066$ million, and again, that's subject to check?
A. Subject to check.
Q. Freda will get me, don't worry.

MR. GRANTMYRE: That is the end of my direct.

MR. WHEATLY: May I ask him a few questions, sir?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Sure. Cross, yes, please.

MR. GRANTMYRE: We would object to any sweetheart cross, and, you know, the redirect comes from the Companies' attorneys. So when sweetheart cross comes, I'm gonna object to that.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Please, overruled.
Continue. After you hear it.
MR. WHEATLY: Thank you, sweetheart.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. WHEATLY:
Q. Mr. Denton, in looking at this system, you were aware of the dead-end lines Mr. Grantmyre just asked you about, are you not?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you don't buy the system, those dead-end lines are still gonna be there, aren't they?
A. They are.
Q. And the flushing they require would still be there?
A. Correct.
Q. And it would be a burden on the existing customers that are there now determining their rates for the County?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, in the agreement that you have with Carteret County, you have agreed to keep the water cost, the rates, the same for the next four years, have you not?
A. That was the agreement with the county.
Q. And on the fifth year, any increase would be controlled by this Commission?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, with regard to the system, itself, when you were interested in buying this system and you made
an initial offer to purchase it, you were aware that the county can only sell property by various statutory process, were you not?
A. Correct.
Q. And that statutory process that was utilized by the County was the upset bid process, was it not?
A. It was.
Q. And that is the process that the County has to go through to determine its fair market value; is that right?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And in going through that process, you and Aqua upset this property a total of five times, did you not?
A. Yes.
Q. And the last and highest offer fair market value to purchase the Company from the County was $\$ 9,500,000 ?$
A. That's correct.
Q. And we entered into a contract along those basis, did we not?
A. We did.
Q. Now, with regard to the system, itself, the operator of our current system is not a County
employee, is it not?
A. That's correct.
Q. And the County has no operator and little or no staff to run this system?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And right now, Carolina Water has been running this system from February of this year to present?
A. Correct.
Q. And up until the public hearing we had in Beaufort a few weeks ago, there had never been any reports of any problems with the water or the system, have there?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Now, you understand also that, based upon your review of the records, that the number of customers that we have online is 1,254; is that your understanding?
A. Yeah, that's my understanding, subject to check.
Q. And you understand the County, in order to subsidize this water system, created a water district?
A. Yes.
Q. And that there were approximately 3,800
parcels within that district?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And within that district, 2,600 of the people living there are paying taxes but are not utilizing any of the water?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Now, you're also aware that the County had -prior to entering into our agreement, had raised the taxes by 95 percent for the customers; are you aware of that?

MR. GRANTMYRE: I would object to that.
I think you raised the rates 95 percent, not the taxes.

MR. WHEATLY: I'm sorry. You're right, you're right. Thank you, sir. I will ask him another sweetheart question.
Q. Mr. Denton, you were aware that the rates were increased 95 percent?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. And for reasons satisfactory to the County, after the hewing cry from the poor customers, the County reduced those rates by 25 percent?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Now, you're currently aware that, without the
operation of the system by Carolina Water, the County would have to provide its own staff, its own qualified, certified water operators; technicians; meter readers; and everybody else?
A. Yes, you would.
Q. Are you also aware that that cost would be somewhere around \$350,000?
A. Subject to check, within that range is what the County is estimating.
Q. But now you're able to operate that system using your existing operators that are in the area, and that that cost to operate the system is not as great as the County would incur had we not had the benefit of your help?
A. There is some incremental cost, but not as much as the County's.
Q. And basically you're able to operate this system much cheaper than we are?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, are you also aware, in looking at the various rates, sustainable rate that would have to be increased by the County Commissioners, in order to set a rate that would pay for the operation of the system, if we had to provide our own operator and own
technicians, would be somewhere around \$98.70 --
MR. GRANTMYRE: I'd object. This is not cross examination, he's testifying. Mr. Wheatly's testifying. And he has his own witness if he's gonna ask this about what the County's gonna do, so I would object to it.

MR. WHEATLY: Mr. Chairman, this
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MR. WHEATY: Mr. Chairman, this
company, the acquiring company, has made a careful study of where they're gonna be. No company is going to want to buy a company they don't fully understand the cost and the associated cost of what the charges would have to be for them to break even and even make a profit. So I think these questions are germane so that the Commission can get a full understanding of the financial situation we are. And why it's in the best interest of the public to go through with this deal. There's less than 2 percent of the people on this system in our county.

MR. GRANTMYRE: Again, I would object. This is not cross examination. This is basically him trying to enter direct testimony. He has his own witness and he could ask the question. His own witness, I believe, is the assistant county manager
could answer questions, and he has filed rebuttal testimony.

MR. DROOZ: Presiding Chair, one other thought on this objection. Normally, cross examination is allowed on a topic where the other party has opened the door on the subject, and I believe the Public Staff did ask a lot of questions about the cost involved relative to the County. And I believe that Mr. Wheatly's cross is going into that topic that was opened up by the Public Staff.

MR. GRANTMYRE: Well, my argument is the Company should be asking the questions on redirect, and instead, Mr. Wheatly is doing redirect, and it's not his witness.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Let's
continue. Keep in mind you aren't doing redirect, so keep in mind it is cross. And please try to ask your questions in a way that -- you did open up the topic, so continue with this line of questions, but just keep in mind you are cross.

MR. WHEATLY: I'll be brief, sir.
MR. CREECH: Mr. Chair, if I can, just
from a clarifying standpoint, in terms of how
things will go forward, will the County be crossing on each of these witnesses before the Company on this, or how will this -- how will this occur?

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Ms. Sanford,
what --
MS. SANFORD: I am perfectly happy with this arrangement. And please -- well, foolishly pleased to go after Mr. Wheatly. I'm not sure that's -- so I don't know if that answers your question, because I'm not sure I understand your question.

MR. CREECH: Well, I'll -- go ahead.
MR. DROOZ: Excuse me. We're not crossing our own witness. We would do redirect.

MR. CREECH: Well, that's certainly
true. But I think I'm just trying to understand. I am probably a little newer to this process at times, but this does seem a newer scenario, perhaps to us all, but defer to the Commission.

MR. WHEATLY: Mr. Chairman, I would apologize. This is my first time I've ever been before the Utilities Commission, and I'm stumbling along the best I can. If you just steer me the right way, I'll try to stay within the rules. I
apologize if I have strayed somewhat.
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Well, if I heard you correctly, you said you were almost finished.

MR. WHEATLY: The most important thing. COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Let's wrap it up. And as far as the questions for cross, do you intend to cross the other witnesses?

MR. WHEATLY: I don't know. Probably not, but $I$ don't know. I hadn't intended to ask Mr. Denton any questions until Mr. Grantmyre opened all these doors and got my curiosity piqued.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Let's continue with this witness, and we'll -- before we start the next witness, we'll have a little discussion about what we're gonna allow. So continue wrapping up the cross for this witness. MR. WHEATLY: I just have one more. COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Please.
Q. Mr. Denton, in looking at the sustainable rate that would have to be imposed for this Company or the system to operate and break even, have your office done any accounting or checking or figuring as to how much that would be?
A. The County's rate or?
Q. Your rate?
A. Yes.
Q. What your rate would be.
A. Yeah.
Q. And, of course, you're aware of what the County rate is?
A. Yes.
Q. And that would be around $\$ 98.77$ ?
A. Correct.
Q. And what was your rate; do you remember?
A. Based on the analysis, post-multiyear rate plan, after the rate freeze that we had proposed and agreed upon with the County, our rate was, in bringing into the uniform rate, less than the $\$ 98$. And, of course, we're making assumptions of what the Commission would allow for rates that case post multiyear, but it was in the 90 -- around 90 range.

MR. WHEATLY: That's all the questions I have, sir.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Redirect?
MS. SANFORD: Redirect. Thank you.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SANFORD:
Q. Mr. Denton, I'm gonna try to move briskly through some questions which will allow you to respond
to some of Mr. Grantmyre's cross examination. You were asked about, generally speaking, why you weren't -- why you didn't pursue an acquisition adjustment -- a deal that had an acquisition adjustment, and my question is whether you considered that or not?
A. We did not. The thought process was this new mechanism was put in place just for this purpose. And so we followed the new mechanism, the fair value mechanism.
Q. And the case to which Mr. Grantmyre referred that was the North Topsail water and sewer case, well before your time here, but I'm gonna explore your understanding of it. The one in which he mentioned now Justice Irvin, then Commissioner Irvin, was, I believe, the author of the opinion. Was certainly on the panel.

Have you looked at that case? Have you had any discussions about that case with respect to the examination of troubled systems and acquisition adjustments?
A. A little bit, yes.
Q. And so you knew about that and you knew about the opportunity to do acquisition adjustments, right?
A. Yes.
Q. But you elected to use the relatively newly
adopted G.S. §62-133.1A, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you have that before you? I think that was the first part of Mr. Grantmyre's cross examination exhibit.
A. I have it right here.
Q. On the first page of that -- I hesitate to say other page numbers, but the first page of the copy of the bill, would you read the caption of the bill that begins with "a bill to be entitled"?
A. Yeah. I actually have the wrong one.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Those pages were confusing.
A. Multiple copies.
"A bill to be entitled, an act authorizing water and sewer -- water and wastewater public utilities to elect to use a fair value determination for ratemaking purposes when acquiring utilities owned by counties, municipalities, or other government entities."
Q. And this act was passed well after that North Topsail case; is that correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And it says that the authorizing water and
wastewater public utility can elect to use fair value determination?
A. Correct.
Q. It doesn't say the Public Staff can elect?
A. It does not.
Q. And so you made that election in this case as you approached the deal with Carteret County; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you believe this to be a preferable path for expansion for acquisition to the alternative of using original cost evaluations and acquisition adjustments; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you -- with respect to questions -- and I'll go in order of the questions. They -- I probably could organize a little differently, but I won't. I'll try to go in accordance with my notes here.

With respect to questions about intention to install lines and boosters and to make various kinds -and I'm not being dismissive of these things, they sound very important and they would be costly determinations -- as you would examine going forward what you need to do, lines, booster pumps, et cetera,
would you do that as you currently evaluate your construction and operation and repair decisions with Carolina Water?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Would you do that with an understanding that you needed to have a reasonable and prudent outcome?
A. Yes.
Q. And that you would be judged by this Commission on that?
A. Very much so.
Q. That the setting of your rates would be dependent upon whether you showed that?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And you would be subject to the continuing examination of the Public Staff?
A. Yes.
Q. So those decisions, should you be allowed to purchase -- should these transactions ensue and you be allowed to purchase it, you would continue to make your decisions with respect to this new system the same way you make them to your current systems; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. This is -- is this true with respect to cleaning tanks, the whole -- the whole gamut of
operational and construction necessities?
A. Yes.
Q. All right.
A. Good asset management practices.
Q. Okay. With respect to your opening price as you began the bid process for Carteret County -- and I think you've addressed this, I will go quickly here.

But your initial price was 4.9 -- or offer was $\$ 4.9$ million?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you said you basically put in plain terms knew you weren't gonna get it for $\$ 4.9$ million?
A. That is correct.
Q. Is this akin to the process people would employ when they make offers on cars or houses or anything of significance?
A. That's how we approached it.
Q. And you were engaged in a process that was public, that had open -- open bids and employed the upset bid process that you talked to Mr. Wheatly about, right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And the outcome, as we talk about value, and there were questions about value and how you determined
value and how anybody should accept your -- why anybody should accept your determination of value, in this open process with upset bids, which is, if not -- as I understand, and I'm knitting together a little bit, but my understanding is certainly a way that the County can sell if not the only way that they can sell an asset like this.

As you participated in that, did you understand it to be a process with a willing buyer, willing seller?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you understand that, under the statute that we're talking about, the fair value statute, that the purpose as drafted and, as indicated in the legislation, was to use a market-based valuation?
A. Yes.
Q. Market-based, willing buyer, willing seller, five upset bids; that's what you experienced?
A. That is what we experienced.
Q. And you also have participated in -- have you participated in what you believe to be the instructions from the statute as to how this fair value determination is made?
A. Yes.
Q. And that fair value determination, do you understand it to be one that then leads to a conclusion about rate base?
A. That was our approach, yes.
Q. And did you rely on the plain language of the statute and of your ability to elect this option as you approached and participated in this deal?
A. We did. The two statutes are very complimentary from that perspective.
Q. And, in fact, the result of the fair value process, which we -- which I believe your position would then translate into a rate base decision, but the averaging of the three appraisals, can you tell us how that compared with the price of the deal you actually struck through the bidding process?
A. The average of the three appraisals was higher than the final offer in the upset bid process with the County.
Q. As you make reports and recommendations within your corporation -- will you have to do that, to authorize that, to be given authority to make significant business decisions; is that right?
A. We do. We have a governance process.
Q. Was -- internally to the Company, are
decisions about or verifications of actual value, is
that part of your decision-making process?
A. Yes.
Q. And in this case, did your corporation depend upon -- in your opinion, did your corporation depend upon the plain language of this statute?
A. They did.
Q. And you were authorized to make an election to use this statute?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you believe you've complied with the formula that's set forth in this statute?
A. Yes.
Q. With respect to the conversation about economies of scale -- and this goes more generally to what Mr. Grantmyre was discussing as benefits to -benefits, generally, but $I$ want to talk about benefits to existing customers.

Has Carolina Water pursued a policy of expansion and consolidation in North Carolina?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that important to Carolina Water?
A. Very much so.
Q. You have sometimes done that with respect to
being willing to be an emergency operator when there's a terribly distressed system; is that right?
A. We have.
Q. You're the only one that's done that for the past several emergency operator cases, aren't you?
A. That I'm aware of.
Q. And you have otherwise pursued a policy of expansion; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And does the Company -- is that a policy for the corporation in North Carolina, is that a goal?
A. It's a goal and a strategy, yes.
Q. A goal and a strategy. Okay.

And this is very subjective question and you may not be able to answer it, but have you felt encouraged in the regulatory process to expand, to consolidate? I mean, do you feel like North Carolina has been a state that is encouraging of that?
A. Between -- not only -- I mean the latest two legislative and regulatory rulings, the -- not only the fair market value, but also the multiyear rate plan legislation that was pushed through is something that our company and parent are very excited about the future of North Carolina and the opportunity to
consolidate and acquire systems and grow and invest in North Carolina, yes.
Q. With apologies, I want to circle back to where we started, and we're gonna finish up there.

Would you pull that bill again, please.
A. Sure.
Q. Copy of the statute. And I'm on what I have as page 1. It's page 1 of the statute, I think.
A. Okay.
Q. At the top caption with the little block that says HB 351, March 14, 2017.
A. Got it.
Q. I want to look at the language on the front of that first page. 62-133, how rates are -- "how rates fixed" is the caption.
A. Yes.
Q. Under subsection (b) (1), would you read -would you start with "in fixing such rates" and read down to the words "test period"?
A. "In fixing" -- sorry.
"In fixing such rates, the Commission shall, one, ascertain the reasonable original cost or the fair value under G.S. §62-133.1A of the public utilities property used and

> useful, or to be used and useful within a reasonable time after the test period."
Q. And so do you understand that to mean that the Commission can either ascertain regional -reasonable, I'm sorry, original cost, or it can ascertain fair value, and that they are different?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to invite your attention to subsection (c), the sentence that's underlined which is the new, the new language.
A. Okay.
"If the public utility elects to establish rate base using fair value, the fair value determination of the public utilities property shall be made as provided in G.S. §62-133.1A, and the probable future revenues and expenses shall be based on the plant and equipment in operation at the end of the test period."
Q. And this applies to you in this case because you have elected to use the fair value methodology, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And have you understood that you -- that this
determination was made as strictly specified in the statute?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you familiar with the Commission's rule?
A. Yes.
Q. R7-41, I think it is.
A. Yes.
Q. And you have -- have you structured your efforts in this case towards compliance with the rule?
A. Yes.
Q. Which sets forth the way in which you can make the election.

I have one last question, and this has to do with the rates. There's been some conversation about the rates that would be charged ultimately to the County under the APA and the arrangement that you have with the County. And I forget where it is, I apologize for not knowing which document it's in right this minute.

But there was conversation about it earlier, that your rates would be the County's rates for the following fixed for a three- to four-year period?
A. That is correct. We intend to honor the
agreement that we put in place with the County to hold rates at the current County rates for four years.
Q. And then filed in this docket -- again, I apologize $I$ don't have the piece of paper in front of me -- but filed in this docket is a table, I believe, in which the rates are shown to be frozen for a period of time. And then at year four, year five there is additional rate, a rate.

And that you were requested to provide, or directed to provide, $I$ forget which way it was, because that's what you estimate rates might go to at that period of time; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that is, if you got the multiyear rate plan decision, and if all sorts of variables about costs went your way?
A. Correct.
Q. So that number should be understood by everyone to be a very speculative number about events that would -- will not be known about for a number of years; is that correct?
A. That's correct.

MR. GRANTMYRE: I'd object. Number one,
I don't remember asking any questions about

Carolina Water's going-forward rates, you know, specific, like Ms. Sanford's going now after a rate case or going forward. It was just in general, I was talking about things increase the rates.

MS. SANFORD: I have no more questions, which is not the answer to Mr. Grantmyre's objection, but I have no more questions.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Overruled. We are gonna take a break now before Commissioner's questions. Don't go away. We will be back here on the record at 3:10.
(At this time, a recess was taken from 2:54 p.m. to 3:10 p.m.)

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Let's go back on the record. Hanging in there, Mr. Denton?

THE WITNESS: I am, yup.
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: All right. We do have a number of staff questions, so I'm gonna go through some of those. I realize that you might have had elements of these already, but do your best to answer them.

EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER HUGHES:
Q. In your direct testimony on pages 3 to 6, you discuss the public interest and the benefits both to
the existing Carolina Water customers and the acquired customers. In particular, on page 7, beginning on line 18, you state that:
"Carolina Water's existing customers will also realize benefits from the acquisition of the Carteret County utility system. The additional customers gained by this transfer will provide economies of scale by spreading existing fixed cost over a large customer base."

Could you just briefly describe what you mean by specific existing fixed costs?
A. Sure. So as we look at our call center, the back-office systems, the -- some of the overhead associated with my costs, the office, those kinds of things, right, that is spread across -- fixed costs, those are spread across a much larger base. This acquisition will add roughly to the -- if we get to the point of uniform but the uniform group of customers, it's an additional 4.5 percent in addition to those. And it's roughly 27,000 water customers in that group. So this addition is roughly about 4.5 percent.
Q. Thank you for that. Looking at the other -on the other perspective, would the acquisition of the

Carteret County utilities system also involve the addition of new fixed costs that will be allocated to Carolina Water's existing customers?
A. Well, there are costs associated with the system, itself, but the way that we've calculated it, that there's -- in year five, and we're making lots of assumptions with regards to rulings by the Commission between now and then -- that we don't see an impact to other customers.
Q. Okay. Is there any limit to the principle that existing Carolina Water customers benefit from economies of scale created by new acquisitions? In other words, is there a fair value so high that the economies of scale do not provide a benefit to Carolina Water's existing customers?
A. Yes, I would agree with that premise. There is some threshold where it doesn't work.
Q. Okay. Do you have the secret number yet?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Public Staff witness Junis has calculated that, if the Carteret County system were brought into the Carolina Water uniform rates today, it would raise the rates of Carolina monthly metered customers using 4,000 gallons a month by approximately 4.5 percent.

Mr. Junis' direct testimony, page 28.
Do you agree with that calculation? And if not, has the Company performed its own calculation?
A. I don't agree with that calculation, and yes, the Company has performed its own calculation.
Q. Is there a percentage increase in rates that would be too high for existing customers to realize net benefits from economies of scale?
A. Yes. I would agree with that, and we have not calculated what that looks like.
Q. Okay. And the first number that you calculated, can you share that or is that -- if you have and you're comfortable. If we're getting into the area where you're not comfortable yourself presenting that number, then we can skip it.
A. Yeah. What we've assumed, and I'll turn to it, is that post freeze, which is encompassing Sub 400, and a 5 percent increase in the following rate case, which is when Carteret rates would -- we would propose roll into a uniform basis, would be at $\$ 92.94$.

And again, this is making lots of assumptions between now and then. So it's giving you a very accurate number based on a lot of assumptions, which is less than the Sub 400 rates and a 5 percent increase
without Carteret.
Q. Okay. And I realize this is not apples to oranges. I think the Public Staff's number is calculated for today.
A. Yeah.
Q. And you've moved it forward?
A. Assuming --
Q. I understand it's not -- we have two different numbers that we're looking at.
A. Correct.
Q. Is Carolina Water contemplating additional fair value acquisitions?
A. We would like to see some, yes.
Q. Can you state any limiting principle on how many fair value acquisitions, in terms of aggregate additions to rate base or additions to rate base per customer?
A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Limiting?
Q. So is there -- is there -- is there an amount that -- well, let me read the full question again.

Is Carolina Water contemplating additional fair value acquisitions? You said yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Can you state any limiting principle on how many fair value acquisitions -- the amount of fair value acquisitions, in terms of rate base or rate base per customer would, in your view, exceed the benefits existing customers get from economies of scale? So I think it's a question similar to the first question, honestly.
A. And I would say that we haven't done that math, to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. On pages 5 and 6 of your direct testimony, you discuss tools that the Commission has to protect ratepayers and maintain the public interest. And you specifically mention adjusting the fair value rate and establishing a separate rate class for the acquired system. North Carolina General Statute §62-133.1A states that:
"If the application meets all the
requirements of Subsection (c) of this section, the Commission shall issue its final order approving or denying the application within six months of the date on which the application was filed."

Hearing that, do you agree that the one tool the Commission -- that one additional tool the

Commission has to protect customers is to simply dismiss a fair value application and deny it?
A. No. I don't necessarily agree with that. I do look at Section (e), which is the one that Mr. Grantmyre had me read, which is under the Commission's authority. And that specifically says that the Commission may adjust the fair value as it deems appropriate in the interest -- in the public interest at a reasonable fair value.
Q. So your answer is that we don't have the authority to deny an application?
A. No, I'm not saying that. I'm saying you've got this as well.
Q. Okay. Okay. So that is a tool that we would have?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. As you noted in your testimony, the Commission has the authority to classify the acquired system as a separate rate entity in future rate cases.

Here, the Company proposes to bring Carteret County system into its standard system rates in its next rate case, correct?
A. After the multiyear, correct.
Q. Okay.
A. And after the -- what we would intend is to honor the agreement that we put in place with the County is the -- establish current rates for the next four years.
Q. Okay. So why is the Company not planning on asking for system-specific rates at this time?
A. Well, we've -- we actually have been working towards getting to uniform across the state, and so we want to continue that. We'd rather not have multiple rate structures if we can avoid it.
Q. Okay. All right. Is there some factors that would occur that you might ask for that in the future, an acquisition to be system-specific?
A. I can see that there is a possibility that there would be a different acquisition where that might be necessary.
Q. You state on page 7 of your direct testimony that:
"We plan on operational continuity by looking to maintain existing operational support."

Does Carolina Water plan to hire the existing field personnel to operate the -- Carteret County's utility system, or will part of the operations be provided by Carolina Water's existing field personnel
that presently operate Carolina Water's existing systems in the Carteret County area?
A. Yeah, we're actually operating the system today. And so the personnel that are there would be the personnel that would continue.
Q. Okay. Exhibit -- thank you for that.

Exhibit 5C of the application, it's a
document titled "Update to Present Value of Water System Draft."
A. Okay.
Q. It's dated December 2021 and was prepared by Draper Aden Associates.
A. (Witness peruses document.)

Okay.
Q. Is this the primary document that you present in the application to comply with North Carolina General Statute $\$ 62-133.1 \mathrm{~A}$ and Commission rules that set the requirement to conduct an, in quotes, assessment of the tangible assets of the system to be acquired?
A. Subject to check, I do believe that's what we used, yes.
Q. Okay. And then who retained Draper Aden Associates to prepare that report?
A. I believe that report was done for the County.
Q. So were you -- was the Company involved in preparing the scope of work or directing?
A. No.
Q. Okay. All right. So the County statement of fund net position, proprietary fund as of June 30, 2021, was attached to the application?
A. Okay.
Q. If you look under the current -- I'm not sure you need this, but if you can find it -- I don't actually have the exhibit number.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: The net position, the statement of fund. Proprietary fund as of June 30th.
(Pause.)
Q. I apologize, I'm with you. There's several attachments and different ways of numbering things. Let me see.
(Pause.)
MR. DROOZ: Mr. Hughes, if those are not easily available, we can always put him back up after the appraisers or something at a point when everybody's had a chance to make copies or get
those.
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Let's do that. I apologize. We have rebuttal, so let's skip over that.
Q. Well, maybe I could ask the essence of the question and we might not have to go to that. At the last -- at the last -- the last county statement there's listed cash and equivalents at $\$ 1.9$ million. So just there's listed cash and equivalent.

Are any cash and equivalent assets part of the transaction?
A. I'd have to check. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Okay. We'll get everything for you.
A. I do not think so, but I would have to check.
Q. Okay. We'll put that on the burner.

Pursuant to North Carolina General Statute §62-133.A(e) [sic]:
"If the Commission finds that the average of appraisals will not result in a reasonable fair value, the Commission may adjust the fair value as it deems appropriate and in the public interest."

In this proceeding, if the Commission were to determine a fair value less than $\$ 9.5$ million, the
agreed-upon purchase price, and the Company continued with the purchase, the Company would record an acquisition premium on its books for the difference between the purchase price and the fair value; is that your assumption?
A. That's -- yes, that is my assumption, if we were to proceed.
Q. Okay. In the past, the Commission has allowed a public utility to establish an acquisition incentive account for all or a portion of an acquisition premium that could be converted to rate base when the utility purchases a nonviable water system. I'm sure you're familiar with that tool?
A. Yes.
Q. So a nonviable water system, a system that would be considered to be a water system whose currently owner does not have the financial, technical, and managerial capacity to provide advocate service to customers.

If this transfer results in an acquisition premium for Carolina Water, would Carolina Water request an acquisition incentive account similar to what has been done in the past as an option? Do you think an account like that would provide added public
interest benefits?
A. It's hard to forecast what we would do, but I can see the benefit if that were to come about in the way you described. So we would have to evaluate it.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that. This next series of questions is concerning depreciation of the fair value rate base of the Carteret County system on the Company's books.

North Carolina General Statute
§62-133.1A(b)(5) states that:
"The normal rules of depreciation shall apply against the rate base value upon purchase of the system by the acquiring public utility."

Are you familiar with that --
A. Yes.
Q. -- requirement?

If the fair value rate base is determined to be $\$ 9.5$ million, will the Company depreciate the $\$ 9.5$ million on its books and records at a composite depreciation rate, or will the Company allocate the $\$ 9.5$ million to various asset categories based upon the engineering assessment prepared by Draper Aden or the County's audited financial statements where different asset categories will have different depreciation
rates?
A. It would be to different asset categories. But, in general, that is roughly about 2 percent.
Q. Okay. When would Carolina Water begin depreciating the fair value of the assets on its books and records?
A. At transfer. At the time of transfer.
Q. Okay. The Company has stated in its application that it does not plan to change rates for the acquired customers in the next four years.

Has the Company calculated the undepreciated value of the fair value rate base of $\$ 9.5$ million at the time the Company proposes to increase rates for the acquired customers?
A. We have created -- calculated a rough calculation based on the 2 percent assumption.
Q. Okay. So that's how?
A. Yeah, yes.
Q. And then for that assumption, I think you said it a few minutes ago, but what would be your rate test year that you would be using for the next rate?
A. It would be the fourth year of the freeze.
Q. Okay. So that would be the -- that would be when you would be looking at --
A. That's correct. And the remaining rate base is roughly about $\$ 8.7$ million.
Q. 8.7. Okay.

Will Carolina Water shareholders absorb the depreciation expense that is taken on the books and the foregone rate base return on the undepreciated value to Carolina Water between now and when the rates are adjusted?
A. Assuming that current revenues -- or current rates are used to first cover the incremental O\&M that's reflected in the budgets and estimates, that we would forego about -- and yes, they would cover the roughly $\$ 880,000$. That's roughly what the number is.
Q. Okay. Can the Company confirm that it does not plan to request any special deferral accounting treatment related to any foregone depreciation or return?
A. We do not.
Q. Okay. You do not confirm or --
A. We do not plan on --
Q. Okay. So you can confirm?
A. Correct. I can confirm that we will not -do not plan on it.
Q. Okay. That -- those are my questions for
you. Let me see if my colleagues have any customers -questions.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Chair Mitchell. EXAMINATION BY CHAIR MITCHELL:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Denton. A few questions for you. I'm gonna start with an easy one. The packet that the Public Staff handed out, I'm not gonna -- I won't ask you to find a page there, but it involves some responses to data requests.
A. Yes.
Q. And there is a response that identifies three funds, three public -- sources of public funding, basically, the state revolving fund -- well, it actually identifies two, I guess, the state revolving fund and the USDA water revenue bond.

Is Carolina Water eligible to pursue funding from either of those sources?
A. The state revolving funds, we are, but it's very limited for water and wastewater companies, unlike some of the other utilities that have a broader spectrum. And we -- we are eager to further the conversation with the legislature with regards to access to -- equal access that government agencies actually have to level the playing field for, quite
frankly, the same monies that all taxpayers are paying into. So yes, we want to further that conversation.
Q. So is that the only source of public funding that is available to water and wastewater systems that investor-owned utilities can access in North Carolina at this time?
A. That's the only one I'm aware of.
Q. Okay. And when you say the IOU's ability to access funding is limited, what does that mean?
A. Well, it's specifically to, for instance, on the water side, right, and it's usually larger projects.
Q. So it's only water?
A. Yeah, well, right now --
Q. -- so you can't get it from wastewater?
A. -- it's -- wastewater is limited. There are some things that are in there that -- my understanding that we could potentially get access to on the wastewater side, but it's not as broad as it is on the water side. And so we want to be able to open that up and get more access to both water and wastewater funding.

The size of projects that could be funded in a lot of cases are so small that the cost of the actual
doing the paperwork for the grants, it over -outweighs the benefit of the grant, itself. And so --
Q. Can you -- can you help me understand a little bit more about the fund? Are those appropriated dollars or are those federal dollars that have come into the state?
A. My understanding -- and my understanding is limited at this point, we're just getting into this, but it's -- my understanding is it's coming from -it's federal money coming into the state. And I don't know if that's correct or not, but that was my understanding.
Q. Okay. But what I do hear you saying is that the Company is interested in accessing those funds and working with the legislature to --
A. Absolutely.
Q. -- to facilitate access by the IOUs?
A. We would like to get as -- we want to expand into grants that are -- whether it's federal- or state-based and level the playing field. We understand that there is a -- starting to be a disparity in rates between the IOUs and government agencies.

And so we want to change the model, if you will, a bit, wherein the model has specifically been
funding through our investors. That we would like to get grant monies for capital projects. Now, obviously, this is not O\&M, because it's not -- that's not an ongoing fund. These are capital project offsets. And that we would want to obtain those monies similar to government agencies.
Q. Okay. All right. Well, we will continue this conversation at a later time. The -- can you -sort of changing gears on you now.
A. Sure.
Q. Can you tell me some about these two systems? I mean, Mr. Grantmyre walked you through the maps and, sort of, gave us a good visual, but the -- I'm specifically interested in whether there is room for growth on these systems. Because what I've read in the testimony and what I believe I've heard today is that there are not quite 4,000 people or parcels in the tax district, and only a -- you know, half or a third of those parcels take service from the systems at this time.
A. Right.
Q. So make sure I understand that correctly, and then elaborate further on potential opportunity for growth.
A. Absolutely. I think -- and the County can, obviously, weigh on this later as well, but my understanding is there is opportunity for growth. There are a lot of customers that are there that are right -- for instance, right on the water system, but they have their own wells. And at any point they can interconnect, but they've chosen not to, right? And so there is that component of it.

However, you know, as you think about emerging issues -- I'll throw it out there, PFOS, right -- that we would have to at some point potentially, we're gonna monitor, we're gonna check. We've done that throughout the state for every well that we have. We've done PFOS testing. We would do the same here. And if we, you know, saw that there was something that was above whatever threshold the EPA decides to put in place next year, that we would comply and treat the water appropriately.

At that point, the question then becomes, those individuals with wells, would they want to interconnect, and we would obviously make that offer.
Q. Okay. What can you tell me about why there are so many parcels that are not interconnected at this time?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay.
A. I don't know.
Q. Have you reviewed the appraisal that was prepared for the Public Staff?
A. Yes.
Q. And are you aware that one of the valuation methods used was the income method?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. One of the assumptions, as I understand it, is -- has to do with an increase in customer connections.

Do you recall the assumption utilized for increasing customer connections?
A. Not off the top of my head. But I remember --
Q. Okay.
A. I remember reading it.
Q. Okay. Well, just accept subject to check, if you will --
A. Okay.
Q. -- that the -- let's see, I've got it. I'm looking at page 24 of the -- of the appraisal, and it was -- it's an attachment to Mr. Lane's testimony,
but -- so the assumption is that NewGen assumed that January 2021 connection counts escalated by one year of growth for the system are an accurate representation of total number. NewGen escalated active connection count annually by 1.13 percent.

Is that -- what -- what can you -- is that -is that -- is that assumption a valid assumption? Is it accurate? Do you think that growth in customer connections might be greater than that? I just asked you three questions. I recognize that. But just do your best to answer all of them.
A. That was the blank face, right? No. I think I don't have any information to challenge that number off the top of my head. I would say, obviously, it's coastal community. It's -- you've got a lot established, but it's also been a community that -- and a county that's one of the higher growing in the state.

And so to me, that number, just gut reaction, is a little low. But $I$ would have to validate that with technical information.
Q. Okay. And how many -- how many of the parcels that are -- that could be served by the system but are currently not, how many of those are developed?
A. Again, I don't have that information.
Q. Okay. I mean, are we talking about a bunch of undeveloped lots out there versus homes that are there that are served by wells? I want to get a sense of the potential for growth?
A. Right. I understand what you're asking, I just don't have that information.
Q. Okay. All right. Bear with me. All right. One last question, then I'll turn it over.
A. Okay.
Q. The application filed in this docket --
A. Yes.
Q. -- by the Company included a proposed schedule of rates for these systems. I just want you to confirm for me, for purposes of the record, that the proposed schedule of rates, $I$ think it's -- it says Form Application Exhibit 12, but I want you to confirm for me that those are Carteret County's existing rates.
A. Let's see.
(Witness peruses document.)
I don't have the attachment. Can you --
Q. It's 12, Form Application Exhibit 12 is what it says on the top of the document.
A. (Witness peruses document.)
Q. Why don't we do this --
A. Yeah, I may not have the application.
Q. I'll ask you the question on rebuttal.
A. Okay. That's fine. I will pull that up.
Q. Okay. Nothing further.

EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER:
Q. Mr. Denton, I've got a couple of clean-ups. They're just really clean-ups on things you've been asked about that $I$ need to nail down in my head.

Do you have the Application there?
A. I thought I did. I do not have the Application. That's what $I$ was looking for and I do not.
Q. It will go a lot quicker if your counsel can help you get the Application in front of you. It will go a lot quicker.

MS. SANFORD: I apologize, we don't --
I'm looking at it on the computer and that's no help.

COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: I see.
CHAIR MITCHELL: Here.
COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: If he's got it on computer, that's fine too, because I can direct him on the computer too.
Q. What I want to be sure you can find is

Exhibit 6 to the Application.
A. (Witness peruses document.)
Q. And I hope they're tabbed.
A. It is.
Q. Oh, great. And if it is what I think it is, if it is what it is in my book, it's the asset purchase agreement.
A. It is.
Q. Success. Okay. So I'm gonna try to see if we can clean up here this afternoon so it doesn't have to get cleaned up later, a question that Commissioner Hughes asked you about, and what is what happens to cash in the transaction.
A. Yes.
Q. As I look at the asset purchase agreement, there is a section, and it is on page -- sorry, it is -- the title of it is "Accounts Receivable."
A. Yes.
Q. And I think it's section -- in the 3 section, but now I'm the one that can't find anything.
A. (Witness peruses document.)

Section 903.
Q. 903. So it's all the accounts receivable prior to closing remain with the County.

So anything they collect between the purchase price date and closing is, essentially, a receivable converted to cash?
A. Correct.
Q. Would I be correct in understanding that stays with the County?
A. That's my understanding, yeah.
Q. Okay. And there is a Schedule $C$ or Exhibit $C$ to the asset purchase agreement that talks about excluded assets, and it says there are no excluded assets. That's on page 41.
A. Okay.
Q. It's on page 41.
A. My page 41 is -- or this page 41 is the schedule list.
Q. The schedule, it says Exhibit C, excluded assets --
A. Right.
Q. No excluded assets?
A. Yup.
Q. And Section 2.02 is a description of the property being purchased?
A. Yes.
Q. And you can take a chance to read through
that, or take a minute to read through that. As I've read it, I'll represent to you that Section 2.02 , when I read through that, it doesn't describe cash as being one of the purchased assets anywhere.

Is that consistent with your understanding of the agreement?
A. That is.
Q. So if I read the agreement, I read it to say that all cash as of the closing date stays with the County; is that correct?
A. That would be my understanding based on this, yes.
Q. Okay. You don't have any different understanding of what we just went through from those provisions of the agreement?
A. (Witness peruses document.)

Not to my knowledge, no.
Q. Okay. You would remember that, wouldn't you, probably?
A. I would.
Q. I would suspect so. Let me ask you to look at Exhibit 3 to the Application.
A. Okay.
Q. You've been asked some questions about this
topic by Ms. Sanford and by Presiding Commissioner Hughes, but frankly, when I'm dealing with numbers, I need to have paper in front of me or else I'm not gonna keep them in my head. So I'm gonna ask you some questions about Exhibit 3 and that will just help me nail down some things that I think you've been talking to Ms. Sanford and Commissioner Hughes about.
A. Yes.
Q. So that is -- as required by the statute, that's the schedule of proposed rates for the next five years. That's one of the things you have to file. And so I want to ask you some questions about the year 2027 --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- and the number that's there that is a projected average monthly bill at 4,000 gallons a month of $\$ 98.24 . \quad$ So here are my questions, and we'll go through them as quickly as we can.
A. Okay.
Q. Was that $\$ 98.24$ calculated on an assumption that, in that year, 2027, that this system becomes part of the uniform water rate division?
A. It is.
Q. Okay. It's not calculated as if this is a
standalone system?
A. Correct.
Q. Got it.
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Got it. Thank you. Second for that is, does that $\$ 98.24$ assume the projected uniform water rates as of 2027 are the rates as they are today for Carolina Water system uniform rate?
A. 2027 assumes the -- basically, we move through the multiyear, and then I believe the 2027 case is a -- right now is -- in this, is estimated at 10 percent. And where I was mentioning the right at $\$ 90$ earlier today, that number assumes a 5 percent case in 2027. So again, these are all assumptions that we're -- we -- right? So.
Q. I get it, I'm just trying to understand what I have in front of me.
A. Okay.
Q. I'm not gonna go beyond that.
A. Okay.
Q. So -- all right. Let me ask you again. So this assumes that you've got your pending general rate case in which you're asking for a multiyear rate plan. And so when you calculate the $\$ 98.24$, do you assume
that the rates as requested in the pending general rate case are granted as requested?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Got it. And that's true for each year of the multiyear --
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And then you, sort of, bump them 10 percent for 2027?
A. Correct.
Q. Because your multiyear rate plan is ended at that point?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now I will ask you a question about your assumptions, because that 10 percent is a little different than $I$ heard a 5 percent assumption in an earlier answer. Why the difference?
A. Well, based on where we are now in our analysis -- now, forecasting 2027 obviously uncertainty gets a lot higher. And so as we were looking at it, we said that might be -- 10 percent might be aggressive in that year, so we reran the numbers for 5 percent.
Q. And when you reran the numbers for 5 percent, I wrote them down at -- again, I have to write the numbers down, they have to be on paper for me -- \$92.94
is the 5 percent number, right?
A. That is the -- \$92.94 assuming with 5 percent with Carteret, yes.
Q. With Carteret, okay. Now, again, just hypothetical, and don't take anything from the questions, they're just designed to get numbers and then I go off and stew about what to do about the numbers. Suppose I ask you to calculate 2027 without regard to the pending general rate case, assume it didn't even exist.
A. Right.
Q. And your current general rate extended out into 2027.

Do you know what that number would be?
A. No.
Q. Could you calculate it?
A. We could.
Q. Again, I'm looking for apples and apples and then I'll think about oranges separately. I'd like that as a late-filed exhibit, please.
A. Okay. Just so I'm clear so we get you exactly what you need --
Q. Yeah.
A. So is --
Q. Take your current general rates that are currently in force from your last general rate case, project them out five years, put the Carteret system into the uniform rate division, and say what would the Carteret customer using 4,000 gallons a month see on an average monthly bill. And that's in effect under your current rates. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. Got it. Did I get it? We got it nailed. Okay. Thank you.
A. Just making sure I get the head nod over here from them.

MS. SANFORD: We're looking back.
Q. If I need to clarify any further, I'll wait until I get there.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. Thank you, sir. In your experience -and I won't ask beyond your experience -- have you been involved in situations where the Company has purchased a water or a wastewater system, for that matter, or a combined system using an upset bid process -negotiated bid followed upset bids?
A. I have not.
Q. This is the first one you've done?
A. It's the first one.
Q. Have you ever, in your experience, been involved in a process of buying a water, wastewater, or combined system using a sealed bid process?
A. I have not.
Q. You understand what a sealed bid process is?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Do you have different bidding strategies on a sealed bid process from an upset bid process?
A. We might, it's possible.
Q. You might?
A. Yes.
Q. Probably would, wouldn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. Yeah. Okay. Just so I know I wrote the number down right, when you were responding to presiding Commissioner Hughes about your projections or your estimates of what the depreciated -- composite depreciated value of the assets would be at the time that you got to the fifth year, I wrote down -- you said using a 2 percent as the composite depreciation figure, it would be about $\$ 8.7$ million. Did I write it down correctly?
A. 2 percent for four years is roughly 8.74.
Q. All right. Thank you, Mr. Denton.
A. Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY:
Q. So I'd like to follow up on that last line of questions.

Do you know whether the County had other options besides the upset bid process? Did they have the option to conduct a -- you know, a two-envelope sealed bid process where you have the qualifications and then you open up the second bid that has the actual bid? Do you have knowledge of that?
A. I don't. I just know about the statute for the upset bid process.
Q. Okay. And a follow-up to Commissioner Hughes' question, he asked you a question about whether or not dismissal of the application was the only remedy, and you responded no, there is Subsection (e) where the Commission could adjust the fair value.

COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY: So this is a new
process, and please, counsel, let me know if I'm headed into rebuttal.
Q. But just this is a hypothetical. Let's say that the Commission decided to adjust -- have a downward adjustment.

What are your options pursuant to the asset purchase agreement?
A. So our options are to either go through with the purchase with the County or have the provision to walk away from the deal.
Q. And those are your only two options?
A. Right now that's my understanding.
Q. All right. Thank you. And then another follow-up about -- well, actually, I'm not gonna ask that question. Thank you.
A. Okay.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Kemerait?
EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER KEMERAIT:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Denton, I just have a couple of clarification questions from a -- one clarification question from a response that you provided to presiding Commissioner Hughes, and it relates to the statute, and specifically related to \$62-133.1A --
A. Okay.
Q. -- (b) (2). And I'll just read Subsection
(b) (2) .
A. Yes.
Q. It states that:
"The acquiring public utility and selling utility shall jointly retain a licensed engineer to conduct an assessment of the tangible assets of the system to be acquired, and the assessment shall be used by both appraisers in determining fair value."
A. Yes.
Q. And I think I heard your response to presiding Commissioner Hughes' question was that the report prepared by Draper Aden Associates was prepared at the direction of the County. And I'd like to give you an opportunity to provide your response about how that engineering report complies with that section of the statute.
A. Well, there are actually -- so Draper was originally brought in by the County. Did an original report, which I thought was the question, and apparently, I may have misunderstood. But they did the original report for the County long before we were even involved. And then that same engineer was used for the fair value process.
Q. And so for the second report -- the first report was the December 2019 --
A. Correct.
Q. -- feasibility study for water system merger report.
A. Right.
Q. And then the second one was the December 2021 report; is that your understanding?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. And for the second, the update, the December 2021, it -- can you describe who requested that the update be -- what direction was given for the update?
A. We'd been working collaboratively with the County, but the County went ahead and -- jointly, we said we'd go ahead and use them, because it would be a least cost scenario, because they had already done a lot of the work to re-engage that same company. So the County re-engaged with them.
Q. Okay. With collaboration --
A. Yes.
Q. -- from Carolina Water? Okay. Thank you. That's helpful clarification.

And then my second question relates to that same subsection as well. I just want to -- it related to the engineering report. And it states that it is to be an assessment of the tangible assets. And both of
the reports seem to be more about the present value of the asset.

So can you describe your understanding of how that also complies with the statute? The two reports, the December 2019 and then the December 2021 update.
A. Right. So -- well, in order to achieve the value, the engineering company went through and basically identified the assets, right, as part of their engineering report and condition assessment. And so I'm not sure if that answers your question or not.
Q. It does. I think that hearing your position about that is helpful, so thank you. That's all the questions I have.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Commissioner
McKissick?
EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER McKISSICK:
Q. Just a couple follow-up questions on what Commissioner Kemerait was asking you. The statutory condition to prepare an assessment -- an engineering assessment, in your mind, in looking at the language in the statute -- and, of course, it's pretty clear in terms of what it says, you know, the acquiring public utility is telling you to jointly retain a licensed engineer to conduct an assessment of the tangible
assets of the system be acquired, and the assessment shall be used by both appraisers in determining fair value.

Does it say anything in there about the engineer establishing fair value?
A. No, it does not.
Q. And in the form that was attached with your application, and I think that form was 5A, that title, you know, "Fair Value Engineering Assessment Form" -do you want to take a minute to find it?
A. I know where it is.
Q. If you look at that form and go through all the pages that are part of this form, does it ever raise a question about the fair value of the system?
A. What page are you referring to?
Q. Well, if you go to Appendix F, it's a five-page -- excuse me, nine-page document.
A. (Witness peruses document.)
Q. Which is titled "Before the North Carolina Utilities Commission Fair Value Engineering Assessment Form."
A. Yup, got that.
Q. You got that?
A. Yup. And you're asking on the form if there
is, for the engineering assessment, a value?
Q. Yeah. Does it ever say anything in here about the engineering establish a fair value?
A. No, I don't think it does.
Q. So wouldn't you be going beyond the scope of what was requested by the engineer statutorily and by the requirements of this form to go out and have the engineer establish a fair value as Gartin did?
A. Well, the engineer established a fair value in the initial report that they did for the County in the 20- -- I can't remember which year it was. 2019 version of the report. And then as part of the effort, they just updated it. But it wasn't, to your point, a requirement for this.
Q. Would it not, in effect, have been outside the scope of an engineering assessment?
A. It would.
Q. Did you give thought or consideration to employing an engineer other than Gartin to go out and do an actual assessment of the system?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. And in this same form, if we flip over, I guess, to page 3, it talks about customer growth.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. And in terms of residential customers, does it provide a number as well as for commercial customers and for industrial?
A. Yes.
Q. And it looks like a residential over a three-year period, there were a total of 63 customers added; is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And for commercial, 17 were lost?
A. Correct.
Q. And in terms of industrial, 17 were added?
A. Correct.
Q. In your evaluation of the value of the system, did you contemplate or study the growth rate, or lack thereof, of the system?
A. We had a -- some assumptions.
Q. Can you state what those assumptions were?
A. Not off the top of my head. I would have to go back and look through our files.
Q. And as I recall, the system went in around 2012, the larger system with the 1,200-odd customers;
is that correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Did you look at the historical growth rate of the system since 2012 to present in determining your value?
A. I'm not sure that we did.
Q. Would that not have been a critical component of --
A. Probably would've.
Q. -- establishing value?
A. I don't know if we did or did not.
Q. But it would have been a critical --
A. It would have been -- it would have been something we should have looked at, yes.
Q. And if it had a very slow growth rate, would that not have been a serious concern?
A. It would have impacted the evaluation, yes.
Q. And as I recall from public comment that was received during the public hearing, there was certainly information provided as to the reasons people did not tap onto that system; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And will you not agree that it was because most people had wells and did not need the water?
A. That is correct.
Q. Has your company contemplated any actions that they would take to increase the number of households which actually use the system?
A. We've not had formal discussions around that about encouraging customers to hook onto the system. Is that the question?
Q. And is the average hookup cost around \$3,600 or so?
A. I don't know, but $I$ think that's close, yes.
Q. So would you --
A. Subject to check, yes.
Q. Would you consider waiving the hookup cost if it required people to hook up to the system?
A. Potentially.
Q. Have you ever done that in any other jurisdiction?
A. I would have to check. I don't know if we have. I'm sure that that's possible that we have done that.
Q. And the original Gartin report was prepared when they were contemplating a merger; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. With the Town of Beaufort?
A. Yes.
Q. And when that was done, was it not
contemplated that the system would be transferred for a nominal consideration of approximately \$1?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And that $\$ 1$ was what the County thought was a fair and reasonable cost to merge with the Town of Beaufort at that time?
A. I can't speak for the County and what they thought at that point.
Q. Did you have any conversations with the Town as to what discussions had been previously, in terms of working with the Town?
A. I have not.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I don't have any further questions at this time.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Commissioner
Clodfelter has another question.
EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER:
Q. Mr. Denton, apologies to you and to my colleagues. I completely forgot one question I wanted to ask you. It's back to Exhibit 3 of the Application.
A. Okay.
Q. So the statute says that the rates -- if you
buy the system, that the County's rates will be the rates for these customers until the next general rate case. It says "unless otherwise ordered by the Commissioner for good cause shown."

So you don't have to answer this question, but if you've got an answer or a thought or an opinion, I'd be interested in it. You've been in probably more general rate cases than you want to be, and so you've heard the talk in general rate cases about rate shock and gradualism and all that sort of stuff. And I look at Exhibit 3, and I'm trucking along here for four years at $\$ 70.55$ a month, and then $I$ go up 40 percent to over $\$ 90$ a month, and that, sort of, begins to start feeling like less than gradualism. I don't want to necessarily say it's rate shock, but it's surely not gradualism.

So suppose the Commission, hypothetically, were to say we'll set the value the way you want the value set, but we think, to avoid rate shock and to avoid -- and to be consistent with gradualism, we think that really the interim rates for the -- until your next general rate case ought to be stepped up some amount each year. You got any reaction to that? Any comment on that?
A. And just to clarify, between the --
Q. Between $\$ 70.55$ and $\$ 92.94$.
A. Yeah, but over the ' 23 to ' 26 period --
Q. Over the '23 --
A. -- or after '26?
Q. -- to '26 period.
A. Okay. We would obviously have a conversation with the County, if that was the ruling of the Commission. We had intended to honor the agreement that we had put in place with the County, but we would obviously follow the ruling of the Commission.
Q. I don't -- tell me this. I don't find that agreement anywhere in the asset purchase agreement. Is it in a separate document?
A. It's not a document. We actually -- this is --
Q. It's a handshake deal?
A. It's a hand -- that is something that we agreed to.
Q. I understand that. Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to be sure I wasn't overlooking it somewhere in the paperwork, because I hadn't found it in the paperwork.
A. Actually, in Exhibit O --
Q. Exhibit O?
A. Exhibit $O$ actually has language in the bottom of Exhibit O that says "in our next rate case." But this has taken a significant amount of time and multiyear has now come forth, but the language in Exhibit O doesn't mirror the agreement that we put in place -- the verbal agreement we put in place with the County. And that, actually, is a little bit longer than what's in Exhibit $O$ of holding those rates lower.

And that's why I'm phrasing it as we intend to honor the agreement that we put in place with the County, and that was an agreement.
Q. That's a very helpful comment, and I thank you for the reference to -- I had probably flipped past that page when I shouldn't have. But again, I just want to explore the topic, because when we look at this, again, we manage a lot of ratemaking issues that we have to manage, and one of those is avoiding sudden jumps in rates.
A. Understood.
Q. Okay. Thank you for answering the additional question.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Any further
questions from the Commission?
(No response.)
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Let's go to questions on the Commission questions.

MR. GRANTMYRE: I go first?
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yes. And please, to the best you can, refer to the actual question that you're following up on.

EXAMINATION BY MR. GRANTMYRE:
Q. Commissioner Clodfelter, at the end, was asking about your agreement with the County, and -- as to rates, and you said there was a handshake deal.

Isn't it true that Carolina Water influenced the County to increase rates prior to executing the asset purchase agreement?
A. I'm not sure I understand. When you say that we influence the County? The County made the decision on their own.
Q. Yeah. Didn't you ask the County to increase the rates?
A. Not to my knowledge. We didn't ask the County to do -- I'm not sure I understand the question. Ask them to raise their rates?
Q. Yes, so that when you acquired the system, you would have higher rates.
A. No.
Q. Okay.

MR. GRANTMYRE: That's all the questions I have.

MR. WHEATLY: I have none. MR. DROOZ: I do have a few. COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Mr. Drooz? Yes, please.

EXAMINATION BY MR. DROOZ:
Q. I would like to start with the question from Commissioner Mitchell about undeveloped lots and growth potential, and I understand your answer is you hadn't quantified that; is that right?
A. That's right. That's correct.
Q. To the extent there are undeveloped areas and a developer came in and wanted water, would that result in contributions and aided construction coming into the Company?
A. It would.
Q. Okay. You were asked questions by a couple Commissioners about the Draper Aden role as an engineering evaluation. And $I$ don't know if you have a copy of that. It's attached to Mr. Lane's testimony as MGL-2. I wanted to refer you to that exhibit if you
had that available. If not, I'll just read out --
A. Go ahead, I've got it.
Q. Okay. First of all, does that indicate that the Draper Aden report was revised for an update through March of 2022?
A. I'm looking for it.
Q. That would be the first page. It's page 46 of 97 in attachment MGL-2.
A. (Witness peruses document.)
Q. I'm sorry to catch you cold with this. It's the very first page, really, of Exhibit 3, Draper Aden Associates engineer report.
A. I've got it in a different -- I don't have it in the --
Q. Okay. I'll refer you to section numbers to the extent I can.
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Do you see where it says, "update to present value of water system"?
A. What section?
Q. This is basically after the cover page.
A. That's the 2019. I'm looking at the 2019.
Q. Let me bring --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- an extra copy to you --
A. Yeah, I'm looking at the 2019 report, that's why.
Q. -- with the Commission's permission. COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Please, that's fine.

THE WITNESS: Thank you. Got it. Thank
you.
Q. Okay.
A. (Witness peruses document.)

Okay.
Q. Do you see where that says it's revised
through March of 2022?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If we -- bear with me a second here. If we go to the 2019 report which follows, again, do you have the MGL-2 page numbering or not?
A. I don't have that page numbering, but $I$ do have the 2019 report right here.
Q. Okay. If you look at paragraph -- or Section 2.4 , it says "asset maintenance"?
A. Right. Okay.
Q. Does that address some of the engineering needs or care for the system?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you look at Section 2.5, does that talk about improvements that will or will not be needed for the system?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And if you look at Table 6, following that immediately, is there a discussion of the condition of those assets in the system?
A. Yes. Those are the tank -- that is the tank table. Tank maintenance report.
Q. Okay. So looking at that, I mean, we can -without getting into how much detail is needed, does this report, in fact, address some of the engineering conditions of the assets in addition to their consideration of value?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You were asked by Commissioner McKissick about the potential for waiving the connection cost to encourage new customers to come on.

Are connection costs set by the Commission in the tariff, if you know?
A. I believe they are.
Q. Okay. And so to waive cost for certain customers without being undue discrimination, would
that require Commission approval?
A. My understanding, yes.
Q. Okay. And if the Commission is so inclined, would Carolina Water Service be willing to ask permission to do that for this particular system as a way of encouraging growth?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you. There was also a question by Commissioner Clodfelter about the rate freeze and whether that was a handshake deal or if there is anything in writing about it.

Do you have a copy of Mr. Junis' testimony with you?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Could you turn to pages 25 and 26 of that testimony?
A. (Witness complies.)

Mine isn't as organized as yours is.
COMMISSIONER CLODFELTER: Mr. Drooz, if
it helps you, I found Exhibit O. It was out of sequence in my book.

MR. DROOZ: Okay. So thank you, that helps. I just wanted to establish this in the record.

THE WITNESS: 25 and 26 , yes.
Q. Okay. Are you there now?
A. Yes.
Q. And you look at the top of page 26, and does that show the rate freeze proposal?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that was provided by Mr. Junis as discussion of response to data requests that the Company had provided to the Public Staff?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Now, that's not a contractual agreement, is it?
A. It is not.
Q. But it is a commitment that you made in this case on the record to the Public Staff?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. DROOZ: Thank you. That's all my questions.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. Do parties have any motions at this time?

MR. GRANTMYRE: The Public Staff would move that its cross examination exhibits be entered into evidence. I believe it was 1, 2, and 3.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Granted.
(Public Staff Denton Cross Examination
Exhibit Numbers 1 through 3 were
admitted into evidence.)
MS. SANFORD: We would at this point like to move the Application and Mr. Denton's testimony into the record, please.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Motion is allowed.
(CWSNC Fair Value Application was admitted into evidence.)
(Donald H. Denton, III's direct
testimony was entered into the record earlier in this transcript.)

MS. SANFORD: His direct testimony. I'm sorry. Direct. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. You can step down but not be dismissed. I think we have some more questions for you tomorrow.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. And I understand that the next witness will not be crossed, or the intention was not to be crossed, but Commissioners do have questions for Mr. Hartman.

MS. SANFORD: Well, that's my understanding of what -- and I'm looking around the room for agreement that you wanted to talk to the appraisers in the direct phase.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yeah, I was more confirming.

MS. SANFORD: And that we would call them and that you would have questions. And I guess I'm going to say I assume on your questions, we could ask questions, but.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Yes, that's correct.

MS. SANFORD: Okay.
COMMISSIONER HUGHES: More confirming that we haven't changed -- no desire to do additional cross.

MS. SANFORD: Checking as we go. And so with that, we would call Mr. Jerry Hartman. Whereupon,

GERALD C. HARTMAN,
having first been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Witness is open for questions. Commissioner McKissick?

MS. SANFORD: Excuse me, if I might let him identify himself quickly.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Sorry.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SANFORD:
Q. Mr. Hartman, would you state your name and business address for the record?
A. Gerald Charles Hartman, 637 North Park Avenue, Winter Park, Florida.
Q. And you have been retained by Carolina Water Service to testify in this proceeding; is that correct?
A. To -- yes, one of the appraisals, yes.

MS. SANFORD: Okay. He's available for examination. Thank you. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER McKISSICK:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Hartman. Thank you for being here. I do have some questions here from Commission staff. So I'm gonna kind of go through these with you, and you'll certainly need to have a copy of your testimony before you at various times. So if you have that available, try to go ahead and pull that together. I'll give you a minute.
A. (Witness peruses documents.)

I have it.
Q. Okay. We'll start out with some baseline
questions. In applying to be on the list of approved utility valuation experts, this Commission maintains you had tested that a utility valuation expert owes a fiduciary duty to provide a thorough, objective, and fair evaluation.

What does that mean to you?
A. Exactly what it says. Objective, fair, unbiased, and credible work. And it's enforced even by USPAP, which I'm an ASA, accredited senior appraiser.
Q. Okay. Now, for instance, if had you to make a judgment call, how did your fiduciary duty affect your decision?
A. My judgment is applied based upon my experience, training, et cetera, and it's just done unbiasedly. It's what the market is and my analysis of the market. I have been doing this for 46 years.
Q. You have been a utility evaluation expert for 46 years?
A. Not with North Carolina, but in my practice, I've been valuing utilities for 46 years. Bound by the Florida appeals court as an appraiser many, many years ago.
Q. Okay. Have you provided opinions in other utility fair value proceedings such as this one?
A. Yes.
Q. And if so, have you ever been retained by a consumer advocate to give a valuation in a proceeding such as this one?
A. A consumer advocate to give an --
Q. An opinion in this type of fair value proceeding.
A. Do the appraisal for -- well, I do appraisals.
Q. Yes?
A. So appraisal for a consumer advocate? Not in -- not exactly like this. But yes, in Jacksonville, JEA, it's \$11.4 billion situation there. I was retained by the consumers to review and opine relative to that transaction.
Q. When you say to review, were you reviewing an appraisal prepared by someone else and to provide critique and analysis, or what precisely were you doing?
A. I was reviewing the -- the -- well, the appraisals. And I was reviewing a critique, and said that there -- you know, the assumptions that they had made in them didn't make sense at the time, and the deal did not go through.
Q. All right. Has the utility Commission ever not considered your appraisal or applied adjustments to your valuation opinion?
A. No.
Q. All right.
A. Not to my -- my opinion did they do it, not to my knowledge.
Q. Not to your knowledge, okay.

And you would be aware of that; is that correct?
A. Juries have found different outcomes than my appraisal, but not Commissions.
Q. All right. Did you consider using the County's books and records to determine the original cost new of assets?
A. Well, there would be the book value that they keep, and I did -- I have considered such things. And I've been hired by cities and counties throughout the nation to go through their books to bring them up to the appropriate level. Because many books, such as the County's, have accelerated depreciation, they have many assets that are depreciated over 30 years from their 50-year assets.

Many assets are not even put on the books.

So for several clients, municipal clients throughout the nation, I've worked in 36 states, I have restated their original cost. I have done original cost studies.
Q. Did you do that in this particular case in conducting this particular fair value assessment?
A. No, I did not. I accepted the Draper Aden report.
Q. Why didn't you go back rather than accepting the Draper Aden report?
A. Why didn't I go back through all their books to look at all -- it was about a year -- it takes a long time. It's about a year process and it's very expensive to go through, but I've done that same work.
Q. Did you feel obligated to use the engineer's report?
A. Well, it says in the statute that the two entities would hire an engineer and then provide that report. I am a North Carolina PE, have been for many, many years, and I can accept another PE's report.
Q. Now, when you looked at the Gartin report, it did more than provide an engineering assessment; is that correct?
A. It did. It did an engineering assessments
and a facilities costing, and that's what's expected from an engineer that is local and provides the current and local cost for various facilities. That's standard. That's what's normally done. There are a couple of things in the report, such as the land value and a few other items, that an engineer typically does not opine to.

But, generally -- and I adjusted for that. I use a MAI North Carolina appraiser for the land to do the fair market value of the land. The Mashburn Group, Chris Mashburn. And so I adjusted those things out of his report that were not appropriate.
Q. And according to the North Carolina statute, it does not state that the engineer provides a fair value, does it?
A. No. And I don't think -- his report that I looked at, I didn't consider it a fair value. I considered it a facilities costing --
Q. A facilities --
A. -- for that portion, and an assessment of the facilities. An evaluation of facilities relative to permits, et cetera, and the condition of the facilities.
Q. Now, you made reference to the fact that you
had a real estate appraisal done; is that correct?
A. Absolutely. I am not licensed to do real estate appraisals in North Carolina.
Q. Now, in the real estate appraisal that was conducted, did they assume the value of the real estate owned by the utility as being vacant?
A. As vacant, correct.
Q. Did you take into consideration the fact that it would be necessary to make the land vacant to remove all of the equipment and structures that might be there, such as water towers?
A. Correct. So that was the instruction that I gave them. They worked underneath my charge, and I gave them the instruction to assume as vacant.
Q. As vacant?
A. As vacant across the fence.
Q. But did they also attach a value for removal of the equipment or items that might have been erected upon the sites to make them vacant?
A. No. It's not done that way in the industry. How it's done is that you give the tangible personal property that's constructed on the property is then costed out by the engineer and then the fair market value by the appraiser.
Q. All right. Now, in conducting your appraisal, did you believe the -- that assessing the value or cost basis of Carteret County's water systems asset was within the scope of the engineer's professional expertise?
A. Yes. He's a -- they're registered professional engineers. The firm is an engineering firm. I believe costing facilities is within their expertise. I don't -- I did not accept, you know, fair value from them.
Q. Now, is it common for utility valuation experts to use engineers' reports in that type of fashion?
A. Absolutely. In fact, it's -- in Virginia, which $I$ just recently testified in, in the fair market value, they prefer to have a separate independent engineer do the costing of the facilities. It's true in many other states. In Illinois I do the -- I actually do the engineers' reports many times in Illinois for other appraisers.

So it's fair market value states preferred. Most of them prefer it that way.
Q. But that's not required statutorily in North Carolina, is it?
A. It's -- I don't know. It doesn't say it's statutorily required, but it says that you follow industry practice, and that is the industry practice.
Q. Now, in my reading of the statute, it says the acquiring public utility and selling utility shall jointly retain a licensed engineer to conduct an assessment of the tangible assets of the system to be acquired. And the assessment shall be used by both appraisers in determining the value.

I don't see anything in here about them establishing any type of values of the facilities or anything of that nature, even though it may be required in other jurisdictions.
A. Thank you for your comment. But as an engineer, I look at that as a facilities costing and not setting a value. So in the work I did, I just looked at their estimates of cost.
Q. And did you use and rely upon them in preparing your fair values?
A. Yes, and I modified, as I stated, the work to make it fair value.
Q. All right. Now, in your Table 3.1 -- you might want to go to 3.1. Let me know when you're there.
A. You mean Table 1 of --
Q. Table 3.1, yes. Yes, sir.
A. (Witness peruses document.)
Q. It looks like it's on page 3-5.
A. Got it.
Q. Okay. Now, you stated the original cost new less depreciation of facilities owned by Carteret County was $\$ 12,334,000$ is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. It appears that you derived the figure from the document provided by Draper Aden Associates dated December 21 entitled "Update to Present Value for Water System Draft"; is that correct?
A. Correct. I took certain elements of that work that $I$ could use in the costing, yes.
Q. Now, did you speak to anyone at Draper Aden about the report?
A. Yes. I called them, and there's emails back and forth.
Q. All right. And what is the basis your understanding that the figures found in Draper Aden's summary tables represent original cost new less depreciation?
A. It's based upon their work. It's the
original cost, and the only owner is the County.
Q. Okay. Now, if you were to look at this, and I think if you flip the page -- or excuse me, let's go down to this next one here.

What is the basis of your understanding that the figures found in the Draper Aden summary tables represent original cost new less depreciation?
A. Just for the facility assets. That's what it states.
Q. So you just relied upon what is stated; you didn't go back and do any further work?
A. Well, I tested it. The thing is, to re-cost out everything, I did not do that. I tested the sequence within the normal ranges of what you would expect from original cost, depreciating the costs as I showed in my response to staff with the engineering news record construction cost indices for each year of installation. Yes, I went back and looked at that.
Q. Okay. Now, what is your understanding of the difference between Draper Aden Table 1 titled
"Estimated Book Value of Carteret County Water System," and Table 2 titled "Present Book Value Carteret County Water System"?
A. They're two different components. One is for
the booster pump stations and water tanks, and the other is for the remainder of the systems.
Q. All right. Now, why is the estimated book value and the other one titled present book value? I mean, do you think that, in your mind, they needed to have separate titles for representing separate purposes?
A. Well, I asked the question because they didn't have good information, so that's why they estimated it versus the present. Engineering aspects.
Q. And on Table 2, there's an asterisk next to several entries, and a note at the bottom of the page. And if you can see that there, it says:
"Value has been increased by approximately
5 percent from 2019 feasibility study."
Can you explain why Draper Aden increased the values on this table by this 5 percent? Do you know what they meant or what they assumed?
A. That was the --
Q. Did you speak to them about that?
A. That was the increase in cost between the two time periods.
Q. You think it's purely due to inflation?
A. That was my understanding, or their new data.

Inflation and new data.
Q. Did you have any specific discussions about that?
A. I said to them that's what I assumed that you're doing, and they said yes.
Q. So you relied upon their representations, you did not go back to look further to see if there was any other basis or if that 5 percent was reasonable based upon the circumstances that were present with the Carteret County water system?
A. Well, the escalation rate in the ENR CCI approximated that.
Q. Now, can you explain your inclusion of an ongoing concern value in the original cost new less depreciation?
A. That -- that was for the intent -- that was for the intangible -- the only concern was for the intangible cost.
Q. And did you feel it was appropriate to include that ongoing concern value --
A. Yes.
Q. -- in computing the original cost new less depreciation?
A. Well, this is an original cost that has been
trended. So it's a method of using original costs not used by the staff. You know, it's a trended situation.
Q. Now, do you find that that's accepted practice in your business and industry?
A. Yes. As long as the trending is not too far back, yes.
Q. Now, have you provided expert valuation services in jurisdictions that have required it to be excluded?
A. The going concern?
Q. Yeah.
A. Yes. Yeah, I have. And there is three types of property. There's real property, which is land; the tangible personal property, which is all the facilities, equipment, et cetera; and the intangible property. All three properties are what you're buying.
Q. And since you've done -- you have excluded it in other jurisdictions, why did you include it here?
A. I excluded it where it specifically stated that it should be excluded.
Q. Okay. How did you arrive at the figure $\$ 247,000 ?$
A. That was based upon going concern for similar systems that were not profitable but for the level of
assets that this had. So I took two components, the profitability into concern, which would be zero, and then the level of assets into concern.
Q. That leads into the other question here. You didn't apply income approach to valuation because you state that as of the year ending June 30, 2021, the system was losing money.

Is that consistent with applying an ongoing concern value?
A. Well, for the incoming component, you would not and it would be zero. For the asset component, you would, and that's what the $\$ 247,000$ is. If you go to Nichols on Eminent Domain, release number 49(1999), the chapter on valuing water and wastewater utilities peer reviewed by the American Bar Association, has my work. But it also has a general section in the front.

And the general section in the front basically says typically going concern for water and wastewater utilities runs from about 7.5 percent to 15 -- to 25 percent -- excuse me -- of the adjusted cost number. You can see that this is more like 2 percent. It's way below the normal going concern allocation for value.
Q. And then you employ the income approach to
assessment value. If you could explain?
A. Why I did not use the income approach? It's become -- it's because a nonprofitable utility, a utility that is owned by government which supposedly works at, you know, not-for-profit situations, there is no net revenue that is not being accounted for to look at future benefits.

And the income approach takes future benefits, present views, takes present values back to the present day. So if there are none and it has been operating to contribute to additional gains, then it's speculative on what the income approach would be. What is the growth rate? I looked at, you know, 1,275 customers over, you know, 17 years weighted average, whatever, and, you know, you're over 100 customers a year over that long time period. Of course, it didn't all come like that, it's uneven.

I looked at other growth rates that are showing, you know, 70 customers in a 2-and-a-half, 3-year period, 25 customers a year. Things like that persistent with this size and this extent, the growth rates were all over the map. It just wasn't -- it wasn't well known, you know, to me. I couldn't find the data for it.

Secondly, I found some data that it said about 533 provisions for new customers were made but the customers weren't connected. Okay? There is 263 of those customers that have been paying minimum charges over time. And it's typical, as a sign-up and save program that many local governments do.

You pay the minimum rate and they waive the impact fee, or the connection charge, whatever you want to call it. So that's what -- programs like that are all over the nation. And so that was done here for 263 customers. We don't know when they're gonna come in. We know that they're not gonna have to pay impact fees. We also know they're close to the facilities.

So when I look at the future growth over time, I could see that possibly 533, because its people went out and actually built stuff for them. I did not include those costs in my appraisal because it's called functional obsolescence because they're not being used. Okay? So that's another $\$ 750,000$ or so to $\$ 1$ million with meters.

I do not know the status of the meters or the condition of the meters, so therefore, I excluded those cost numbers. But for growth over time, there were numbers all over the map. I felt that 533 could be a
number discounted for people not connecting by maybe another 200 or something like that, which is typical in those situations.

And you might have another 300 or 350 customers come in in the next, you know, five to ten years. But I didn't have a good number, so it's speculative. What is the growth rate? Quite speculative. What is the discount factor? Speculative. What is the facilities that you're gonna use to set rates to create income to present value back to today? No one has made that decision.

There has been no decision by the Commission relative to rate base. So for you to assume a rate base that the Commission hasn't determined is highly speculative. And so I find that something I could not do. So therefore, I could not do an income approach, it didn't make any sense. I normally do them.
Q. Well, let me ask you this, sir. It sounds like there was a great deal of uncertainty that was abundant when you were preparing your fair value appraisal.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did you identify all of those uncertainties and disclose them in your report relating to your
inability to determine a growth rate, your inability to know, I guess, the condition of some of these equipments or meters or connections that were out there being paid for that people not yet connected? Did you identify any of those in your report so that that would have all been disclosed as a part of what went into your valuation?
A. I only showed the nonprofitable nature of the operation. Not generating an income. So therefore, I thought it was the simplest presentation, if you will. That income approach would be highly speculative, it's not bound.
Q. Did you consider income that was coming in -other than simply from connections, that might have been coming into the water service district that would have been used to have been applied toward the operating and ongoing cost of the system?
A. The taxation issue for taxes is a County decision on how much and how it's applied over time. And -- because this was a transaction and they were not selling and they can't -- at least to my knowledge, I haven't known an entity that gives up its taxation capabilities to another entity, or dedicates tax revenues that are solely for a purpose to a
profitable -- a profit-making. To a non-for-profit, yes, and it's done all the time in mergers.

I've done, you know, a bunch of different mergers into utility authorities from cities with another city, et cetera, et cetera, and they typically merge. They typically merge at the debt so no one's harmed, if you will, and a minor incentive for the merger. And that's standard. It's a different market.

Government transactions have different rules and regulations.
Q. But this was a government system --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that was functioning and operating and was controlled by Carteret County.
A. That's correct.
Q. And there was, in fact, a water service district where income was being received --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that went towards the cost and overhead expenses of this particular system.
A. Yes.
Q. Would that not have impacted the value that you might have determined based upon the fact that it was a component of revenue just like the revenue coming
in from the actual people consuming water?
A. It's due to the rights and privileges of the County that they could have that revenue stream. I don't know -- I don't think, at least in my work, that an investor-owned-utility has that right and privilege to get that revenue stream.
Q. Okay. Do you know whether other fair value appraisals that were done, other than yours, considered the funds coming into the water service district?
A. I don't.
Q. You do not?
A. I didn't go through them.
Q. You didn't go through any of them?
A. No. I looked at the NewGen, but I didn't get the other one.
Q. All right. Do you believe that your report complies with the statutory requirements found in North Carolina General Statute §62-133.1A(b) (1) (b), which states:
"Each appraiser shall determine fair value in compliance with the uniform standards of professional appraisal practice employing costs, market and income approaches to assessment of value"?

And I point out it says "income approaches."
A. Yes, sir. In fact, I did consider all three approaches, but it doesn't say that you should rely on all three approaches for your fair market value. I believe Mike's work for -- with NewGen, he only relied on the income approach. He did not rely on other costs or market approaches.

So what you rely on is the appraiser's opinion and what they believe is the most credible approach to give you a credible opinion of value.
Q. Okay. Could you please explain your market approach assessment of value, what is the source of the information found on Exhibit 5.1?
A. Exhibit 5.1?
Q. Yes. 5.1.
A. Exhibit 5.1. I have my comp sales section, is that what you're talking about?
Q. Yes.
A. Okay. It's our records and our analyses. I am constantly upgrading and keeping files on sales throughout the country. In fact, I've been involved -personally involved in 6- or 700 so transactions in my 46-year career in doing this. So it's our files, and then we follow up with the participants, et cetera.
Q. Now, in section 5.5 of your report, you state that the subject system was assessed by DA as in good condition; moreover, the subject system was found by DA to be relatively new to adjust for two characteristics, certain sales were dropped from the analysis.
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you remember that? Okay.
A. Many of the sales have regulatory
noncompliance or not -- as a reason for sale as well as the systems are not in very good condition, and we had a lot of CapEx.
Q. Can you explain exactly why you dropped and decided to include certain ones?
A. I wanted to keep in the ones that were in good condition, relatively new, that had the customer base within my range such that I didn't skew to customer base. And I brought them all to the date -the effective date of the appraisal.
Q. Now, can you clarify if Table 5.2 represents the list after certain sales were dropped?
A. No, it's the -- that's the list with the ones I considered before I dropped them.
Q. All right. Now, in Table 5.2, you indicate that you used the top half average from the selected
system sales; is that correct?
A. That's correct. It ended up to be that way.
Q. What was the basis for using the top half average?
A. Because the top half average, or the ones that ended up to be that, were in good condition, did not have a lot of regulatory -- did not have regulatory deficiencies, did not have high CapEx, future cap, capital requirements.
Q. And did Draper Arden [sic] indicate that Carteret County system was in the top half of comparable systems?
A. No, they did not, I did. That was not their opinion, it was my opinion.
Q. Now, you rounded the top half average of $\$ 6,598$ up to $\$ 7,000$ to account for growth opportunities for Carteret County. Is it your conclusion that Carteret County's growth opportunities are superior to those in the regions represented by the seven sales you selected? And can you explain how you reached this conclusion?
A. Well, equal to or superior, yes. And based upon my knowledge of those transactions.
Q. All right. Now, in turning to section 6 of
your report -- if you could turn there, sir.
A. Section 6?
Q. Yeah.
A. Okay. And also in fair market value states, I should say. Section 6. Okay.
Q. In arriving at your overall opinion of value, $\$ 10,900,000$, you give the cost approach one and a half times the weight of the market approach.

Can you explain this decision?
A. Yes. The cost approach is specific to this system. You cost out what you're buying and then it's something -- it's a known. It's very hard, in the public utility business, to get comparables -- unless you participated for a long time and had a lot of data, to get comparables that you would have the same level of confidence as the costing of the specific system, itself. So that's the reason.
Q. That's the reason.
A. And the weighting that I gave it is my own opinion, 60 percent toward the cost approach and 40 percent toward the market approach.
Q. I see.
A. The income approach I did not do, as I previously stated.
Q. And, I guess, just like rounding it up 6,598 to 7,000, that was your judgment call?
A. Yes.
Q. Judgment call due to what you perceived to be the growth rate notwithstanding the pretty retarded growth rate the system had experienced?
A. Well, I was looking at a growth rate of, you know -- potential growth of as many as 500 customers because of the taps and all that kind of stuff that were built.
Q. Over what period of time, sir?
A. It's unknown exactly.
Q. Unknown.
A. It's unknown.
Q. So between now and eternity?
A. Could be. It could be.
Q. All right. Thank you. I don't have any further questions.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: I think we're getting close to the end of the day, but I think I just have a clarification question that I think will go for two or three minutes and then we're gonna have to take a break at 5:00 so we're back here tomorrow. But while everything's fresh on

Commissioner McKissick's questions, if you just could entertain just a follow-up on one. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER HUGHES:
Q. The income approach. You know, I understand that you had made some decisions that it wasn't appropriate. Just for me understanding, kind of, how our appraiser looks at these things, I thought it was interesting some of the things that you said, and I just want to make sure $I$ got them right.

It sounded like you were looking at an income approach from the county's perspective as a governmental entity, and you looked forward and you didn't see income, you just saw -- I mean, maybe I'm simplifying it, but you just saw losses. So that wasn't going to be an approach that made sense. Is that -- am I paraphrasing, kind of, the --
A. That's one major consideration, yes. And in fair value, we you can look in the various cases with condemnation cases, you look at the value in the hands of the seller.
Q. Okay. So that gets to my other question. That question intrigued me.

From fair value, the approach that you would look at, an income approach, is from the seller, not
from the buyer?
A. Well, you consider what the seller's situation is, and does the buyer have an ability to change that situation markedly. And without any knowledge of what the future changes would be, I did not know what Carolina Water would be doing. I don't know how they're gonna integrate it, and I also don't know what the decisions of this Commission are gonna be. So, you know, it's very hard to put it in the hands of an investor-owned utility without some definition.
Q. So -- so -- and I think I'm following you. And you had also said that you at least need to know the rate base, if I understood what you were saying, and you can't know that now.

So is it your testimony that you -- if you don't know the rate base, how can you use an income approach?
A. You would have -- you would have to look at the system where noncash items can be capitalized, if you will, that are deducted in their accounting regime. You would have to look at various adjustments to the County's operation. And if this was a fairly complex system, I would think that that would be readily
capable of doing.
But this system is a pretty simple system. It's -- it's a coronation type system. Pump it up out of the ground and put it into storage and booster pump out to it. It's a very simple system. So what optimizations are there that I could do that would generate revenue, net revenue after expenses. COMMISSIONER HUGHES: Okay. I think
we'll call it there. Does anyone have a two-minute question follow-up? CHAIR MITCHELL: I do just a really quick.

EXAMINATION BY CHAIR MITCHELL:
Q. Just could you point me, in your report, to your assumptions about -- I think you indicated a growth of about 500?
A. That's in my data -- that's in my files. There's about --
Q. So it's underlying your analysis, but I wouldn't see it --
A. It's not in the report, itself. It's not --
Q. Okay. Can you tell me that specific number again?
A. I had some data that said, like, 500 or 533
out of the 300 -- out of the 3,000 -some-odd -- 3,800 parcels had provisions or taps relative for future service. And 263 of those parcels had paid minimum charges such that their impact fees would be waived. That was in my data file.
Q. Okay. And just -- again, just so I'm clear on your responses about your view of an income -- of the income valuation in this context, is it -- I mean, in my mind, you'd have to have presumed sales or projected sales over a period of time as well as a rate at which you're going to charge for those sales.
A. Absolutely.
Q. And so do I understand correctly your testimony today to be that you felt that it was -- that the -- it's too speculative to come up with a rate?
A. Well, I -- what I had in my files was a rate that was losing a lot of money, subsidized by taxation, dropping off taxation. A great increase in rates, not like 95 percent, and then reduction in rates. So in the past short period of time, the rate stability aspect of this system, to me as an appraiser going back and looking at it, was highly variable.
Q. Okay. All right. Thanks. EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER DUFFLEY:
Q. Just one quick follow-up on that. So what I heard you testify, and $I$ just want to get it clear in my head, was that the growth rate was all over the place, and then you talked about the 533, maybe another 200, maybe another 300 in the next 10 years. And I'm just trying to square that with when you were also asked about growth opportunities and growth rate for using the top half average of those sales and rounding up to $\$ 7,000$ per month.

Like, how do those two statements square with each other?
A. Sure. Most utilities throughout -- just as an overall average, if you will -- are growing in the 2 to 2.5 percent, 3 percent, something like that. You know, 500-and-someodd customers would be that over a ten-year period. So you would have a growth capability. The provision of lines available for connection, if you had -- it's an extensive system. And that's stated.

You know, it's got a lot of pipelines all over the place. Okay. And it's got -- that extensive system means that developers don't have to go very far or a new customer doesn't have to go very far to connect to the system. The pipelines are there. So it
would encourage growth intuitively.
And in systems I've seen that did basically build it and they will come, they did get good growth. Not excellent growth maybe, if it's a depressed area, but they get good growth. So that's how I square that away.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HUGHES: We -- now we're
gonna stop for the day, and we'll have you back up here first thing. 9:00 a.m. will be when we start. Thank you-all.
(Hearing concluded at 5:02 p.m. on November 3, 2022.)
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