1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	FOR CAROLINA WATER SERVICE, INC. OF NORTH CAROLINA:
4	Jo Anne Sanford
5	Sanford Law Office, PLLC
6	530 North Person Street
7	Post Office Box 28085
8	Raleigh, North Carolina 27611-8085
9	
10	
11	FOR THE USING AND CONSUMING PUBLIC:
12	Gina C. Holt
13	Public Staff
14	North Carolina Utilities Commission
15	4326 Mail Service Center
16	Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4300
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	EXAMINATIONS
3	PAGE
4	CHUCK VAN RENS
5	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt17
6	
7	JACK ZINSELMEIER
8	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt23
9	
10	JEFF GEISLER
11	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt27
12	Examination by Commissioner Brown-Bland29
13	
14	PHIL REITANO
15	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt30
16	•
17	JEANNIE MOORE
18	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt
19	Cross Examination by Ms. Sanford
20	Examination by Commissioner Brown-Bland41
21	-
22	
23	
24	·

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	EXAMINATIONS
3	PAGE
4	LINDA HUBER
5	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt42
6	Examination by Commissioner Clodfelter45
7	
8	BRIAN MCCARTHY
9	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt47
10	Cross Examination by Ms. Sanford52
11	Examination by Commissioner Brown-Bland53
12	
1 3	RON SHUPING
14	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt55
15	
16	STEVE WALKER
17	Direct Examination by Ms. Holt61
18	Cross Examination by Ms. Sanford66
19	
20	-
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	EXHIBITS .
2	IDENTIFIED/ADMITTED
3	Van Rens Exhibit 123/23
4	•
5	
6	·
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
.13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION APPEARANCE SLIP

DATE 4 - 19
DOCKET #: W 354 Sab 564
NAME OF ATTORNEY
TITLE
FIRM NAME Santard Law Office
ADDRESS PO BOX 14085
CITY Kalelah, NC
ZIP
APPEARING FOR: Applicant CWSNC
APPLICANT COMPLAINANT INTERVENOR PROTESTANT RESPONDENT DEFENDANT
PLEASE NOTE: Electronic Copies of the regulatranscript can be obtained from the NCUC website a
HTTP://NCUC.commerce.state.nc.us/docksrch.html under
the respective docket number.
There will be a charge of \$5.00 for each emailed copy of transcript.
Please check for an electronic copy of the
transcript.
of Copies
Email:
(Required for distribution)
Please check for the confidential portion of th
transcript, only if a confidentiality agreement ha
been signed.
of Copies
Signature:
(Required for distribution)

NORTH CAROLINA UTILITIES COMMISSION PUBLIC STAFF - APPEARANCE SLIP

DATEOctober \$\frac{1}{2}\$, 2019 DOCKET #: W-354, Sub 364
PUBLIC STAFF MEMBER Gina Holt
ORDER FOR TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY TO BE EMAILED TO THE
PUBLIC STAFF - PLEASE INDICATE YOUR DIVISION AS WELL AS
YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS BELOW:
ACCOUNTING
WATER
COMMUNICATIONS
ELECTRIC
TRANSPORTATION
LEGAL gina.holt@psncuc.nc.gov
CONSUMER SERVICES
accessed by visiting the Commission's website at https://ncuc.net . Hover over the Dockets tab, select Docket Search from the drop-down menu, and enter the docket number. / Number of copies of confidential portion of regular transcript (assuming a confidentiality agreement has been signed). Confidential pages will still be received in paper copies.
***PLEASE INDICATE BELOW WHO HAS SIGNED A CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT. IF YOU DO NOT SIGN, YOU WILL NOT RECEIVE THE CONFIDENTIAL PORTIONS!!!!

A CHER
Signature of Public Staff Member

Woodhaven Property Owners Assn.

(Docket No. W-354, sub 364)

Sept. 29, 2019

Dear Sir, NCUC Commissioners and Public Staff,

Please note that James Hemphill, President of Woodhaven POA Inc. and Chuck van Rens Water Chair, Woodhaven POA Inc. will be present and testify at the Asheville public hearing at 7:00pm Oct 9th 2019.

Please see the enclosed letter, resolution and documents where Woodhaven POA, Inc highly objects to the 8.2% base rate increase and the 24.6% double digit usage water rate increases proposed by Carolina Water Service/Utilizes, Inc. to the NCUC. (Docket No. W-354, sub 364) We will be present at the public hearing in Asheville on Oct 9th to clearly make our point of view know.

Please note these comments on Carolina Water Service, which are resounding positive:

- 1. CWS regional mangers and staff have a positive history of responding to Woodhaven needs and issues. It is worth mentioning Stacy Adcock-CWS and previous manager, Gary Peacock-CWS.
- 2. In resolving a historic easement dispute(Smith property) and not destroying the green barrier between properties and putting Well #2 back online. we give special thanks to Bryce Mendenhall, VP of Operations, Thank you

However, we have a history of double digit increases and 50% of requested granted that smack of rubber stamping. Also we will present documentation highlighting that the ratio of public to private water cost in NC is way out of line compared with other states. The document included with this mailing shows NC the second highest in the nation. This is not a good thing. The laws and regulations governing private water rate increase are the culprit. They need to be adjusted to result in a reasonable level. Is it possible to make clear, with a short white paper, the exact methodology used by the public staff to evaluate rate increase proposals.

Highest regard,

Chuck van Rens

Woodhaven POA, Water Chairman

(Docket No. W-354, sub 364)

What can we do with CWS, NCUC and Public Staff? We are not convinced that the collective group is looking after our interest on rate increases.

Whereas:

- 1. Woodhaven POA and Carolina Water Service (CWS) customers are outraged at the 24.57% usage and the 8.2% base proposed water rate increases.
- 2. The frequency of increases(usually a 2 year cycle) is becoming shorter.
- 3. Double digit water rate increase by CWS/Utilities, Inc. and historic double digit rate increases are symptomatic of a process that lacks clarity in justification.
- 4. The complex laws, regulations, and processes of North Carolina Utilities Commission (NCUC) are not customer friendly and give a advantage to lawyer supported CWS/Utilities, Inc. in the rate justification process. We need a simple explanation of evaluation process and methods.
- 5. Historically, submitted signatures of residents, registering as high as 90% of Woodhaven POA members, do not appear in public record and seem to be ignored.
- 6. Woodhaven Base rate should be reduced-CWS pays no taxes on well property and the quality of the water requires far less that average treatment.
- 7. Lack of clarity around the ongoing implications of the 2017 The Tax Act to customer costs, credits and flowbacks.

Therefore, it is resolved that the corporation shall:

- 1. Seek to contact other customers of CWS/Utilities, Inc. and build a coalition of the concerned.
- 2. Undertake a campaign to inform and persuade local, regional, and state government officials of the problems with the laws, regulations, and processes of private water rate increase issues.
- 3. Will communicate a benchmark of public/private water rate increase comparisons as a ratio between states to keep NC's high ratio in line with the average ratio or even better.

Docket No. W-354, SUB 364

Woodhaven/ Pleasant Hill Sub-Divisons

Carolina Water Service Rate Increases - Proposed/Granted

Date of Increase	Base Increses requested	Base Increase Granted	requested increase granted	Cost/Gal increase requested	increase	requested increase granted
Apr-05	36%	18%	50%	33%	19%	58%
Jul-07	24%	14%	58%	27%	14%	52%
Jan-09	24%	9%	38%	24%	9%	38%
Feb-11	28%	13%	48%	27%	12%	44%
Mar-14	23%	14%	61%	23%	12%	52%
Dec-15	23%	23%	100%	23%	18%	78%
Nov-17	20%	10%	50%	20%	20%	100%
19-Feb	15%	12.60%	84%	15%	-8%	-53%
2019/20	8.20%			24.60%		

53% 51% Avg. Increase Granted

Water Bill Comparison Study Compiled by Food & Water Watch

Table 1. Comparison of Annual Household Water Bills of Public and Private Utilities By State(s)

and Private Utilities By State(s)				
	Annual Hous		Percent that	
ST TO STATE OF THE	Municipal	Private or	Private *	
State(s)	or Local Government	Investor	Prices	
ြည်း သည်မှုသည်။ ကိုမိုင်းကို သို့ သို့သည်။ ကြို့ကို ကြိုကြားသည်။ သည် ကြိုကြည်သည်။	Government	Owned	arė 🃜 🔭	
man to the same and the same the	Utility	Utilities.	Greater.	
Alaska ³	\$441.84	\$458.79	4%	
Arizona⁴	\$225.00	\$329.40	46%	
Arkansas ⁵	\$273.83	\$344.68	26%	
California ⁶	\$415.86	\$500.42	20%	
Connecticut ⁷	\$300.72	\$398.13	32%	
Delaware ⁸	\$256.20	\$449.40	75%	
Florida ⁹	\$300.96	\$360.02	20%	
Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio and Wisconsin ¹⁰	\$280.44	\$318.72	14%	
Illinois ¹¹	\$240.84	\$326.88	36%	
Indiana ¹²	\$232.68	\$318.81	37%	
Iowa ¹³	\$219.84	\$314.16	43%	
Kentucky ¹⁴	\$316.07	\$361.21	14%	
Maryland ¹⁵	\$232.50	\$381.00	64%	
Massachusetts ¹⁶	\$357.00	\$481.00	35%	
Maine ¹⁷	\$331.31	\$362.81	10%	
New Hampshire ¹⁸	\$411.70	\$582.00	41%	
New Jersey ¹⁹	\$258.00	\$318.00	23%	
New Mexico ²⁰	\$259.83	\$356.34	37%	
North Carolina ²¹	\$204.12	\$344.76	69%	
Ohio ²²	\$444.73	\$510.40	15%	
Oregon ²³	\$271.79	\$313.97	16%	
Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland ²⁴	\$289.20	\$367.20	27%	
Tennessee ²⁵	\$306.00	\$381.00	25%	
Texas ²⁶	\$329.40	\$553.80	68%	
Utah ²⁷	\$307.23	\$359.05	17%	
West Virginia ²⁸	\$375.40	\$456.82	22%	
Wisconsin ²⁹	\$252.03	\$400.55	59%	
Wyoming ³⁰	\$261.83	\$343.00	31%	
Average			33%	

(Docket No. W-354, sub 364)

- 10 Dziegielewski, Ben et al. "Benchmark Investigation of Small Public Water Systems Economics," Southern Illinois University Carbondale. Department of Geography and Department of Agribusiness Economics. November 2000 at V-26.
- 11 Dziegielewski, Ben et al. "Water Rates and Ratemaking Practicesin Community Water Systems in Illinois." Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Department of Geography. July 2004at III 17: Illinois Commerce Commission, Water Department. "Illinois Public Water Utilities with 1,000 or More Customers Rate Structure Expressed in Gallons General Service." January 1, 2004.
- 12 Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, Water Sewer Division."2009 Annual Water Bill Analysis." January 1, 2009 at 1 to 5.
- 13 Rate schedules compiled from Web sites for all utilities serving more than 20,000 people (large utilities and very large utilities). Schedules for 4 out of 21 utilities were not found. Public system count = 15, private for-profit system count = 2. On file with Food & Water Watch.
- 14 Allen & Hoshall, "Kentucky Water and Sewer Rate Survey," August 21, 2006.
- 15 Rate schedules compiled from Web sites for all utilities serving more than 3.300 people (medium sized utilities and larger). Schedules for 11 out of 57 utilities were not found. Public system count = 41, private, for-profit system count = 2. On file with Food Water Watch, 16 Tighe & Bond, "2006 Massachusetts Water Rate Survey," 2006at 1 to 58; Safe Drinking Water Information System Pivot Tables, 2007.
- 17 Maine Public Utilities Commission. "Cost of water at selected usages." January 2008.
- 18 New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services. Drinking Water and Groundwater Bureau. "2006 Water rate survey larger water systems." (WD-DWGB-16-5), 2009 at Appendix B.
- 19 Peretz, Blossom A. et al. New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate, "Position papers on the water and wastewater resources of New Jersey," May 2001 at 7.
- 20 New Mexico Environment Department. Construction Programs Bureau. "Municipal Water and Wastewater User Charge Survey for 2007 Rates (Based on 6.000 gallons/month December 2007)." May 2008; Safe Drinking Water Information System PWS Inventory. 2007; Olson, Thomas W. New Mexico-American Water Company, Inc. Re: Case No. 06-00208-UT. Filed with the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission, Records Bureau, June 25, 2007.
- 21 North Carolina Utilities Commission. Division of Fiscal Management. "Major Activities through December 207 with Statistical and Analytical Data through 2006." (XXXVIII). February 1, 2009 at 138.
- 22 Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. Office of Fiscal Administration, Economic Analysis Unit. "2007 Sewer and Water Rate Survey," July 2008 at 21 to 31; Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. "2007 Annual Report." 2007 at 11.
- 23 Oregon State University and the League of Oregon Cities. "Water/Wastewater Rates and Charges." December 2004 at 10 to 14; Public Utility Commission of Oregon. "2007 Oregon Utility Statistics." 2007 at 86; Sloan, Rence, Oregon Public Utility Commission, Testimony on Application to Request for a General Rate Increase, Docket No. UW 122, November 20, 2007 at 2, 6-7, 24 Corrozi Narvaez, Martha and Maureen H.S. Nelson, 2008 at 5.
- 25 Allen & Hoshall. "Tennessee Water and Sewer Rate Survey." June2008; Public Water System Inventory Data, 2007; Tennessee-American Water, "Eight Revision of Sheet No. 3-R." TRA No. 19, September 26, 2008 at 3, 8, 11.
- 26 Texas Municipal League. "2009 Annual TML Water and Wastewater Survey Results." 2009 at Water Fees by Population Category Summary; Texas-American Water. [Brochure]. "Notice of proposed water rate change." February 21, 2008.
- 27 Utah Department of Environmental Quality. Division of Drinking Water. "2006 Survey of Community Drinking Water Systems." December 2007 at Appendix B: Public Water System Inventory Data, 2007.
- 28 West Virginia Public Service Commission. "Water Utility Cost Ranking as of May 15, 2009." May 15, 2009: West Virginia Public Service Commission, PSC Database. Available at www.psc.state. ww/utilities/default.htm, accessed May 2009: Jarrett, David. Public Service Commission of West Virginia. Annual Reports & Tariffs Section. "Annual Statistical Report." December 31, 2007 at 10 to 19, 29 Public Service Commission of Wisconsin. Water Bill Comparison. Available at psc.wi.gov/apps/waterbill/bulletin25/default. asp. accessed April 22, 2009: Public Service Commission of Wisconsin. Utility Provider Lookup. Available at psc.wi.gov/apps/ utility/content/findunf.aspx, accessed April 22, 2009.
- 30 Wyoning Water Development Commission. "Water System Survey Report." 2007 at Report #1 and Report #4.