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## I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name, business address and position.
A. My name is Stephen P. St. Cyr. I am president of Stephen P. St. Cyr \& Associates, located at 17 Sky Oaks Drive in Biddeford, Maine 04005, Tel. (207) 282-5222. I prepare Lakes Region Water Company's ("LRWC") PUC Annual Report, financing schedules and testimony, and rate schedules and testimony.

## II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY

## Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. I offer this testimony in response to the rate schedules proposed by Staff Witness Jayson LaFlamme. My testimony today explains those significant areas where the Company disagrees with the rate schedules proposed by Staff. Also, in response to the testimony provided by Staff Witness Mark Naylor regarding the Company's lack of access to debt and capital markets, I have included a schedule for a proposed 2012 step adjustment in order to allow the Company to maintain sufficient rates in order to continue to provide public service and complete capital projects that may be required in the foreseeable future, based on the Company's 5 year capital improvements plan. The Company requests that the Commission approve treatment of this proposed step increase as an alternative form of rate regulation under RSA 374:3-a, subject to the conditions proposed in the Testimony of Thomas Mason.

## III. RESPONSE TO STAFF'S PROPOSED RATE SCHEDULES

## Q. Please explain the Company's response to the rate schedules proposed by Staff.

A. There are many areas of agreement between the Company and the PUC Staff. For example, except for a few minor adjustments to rate base, the Company and the Staff agree on the components and amounts in rate base. The significant area of disagreement as it pertains to rate base is whether to use a year end rate base or an average rate base, which I will address later in my testimony. Also, another example of agreement between the Company and the PUC Staff is the capital structure, except for an addition to retained earnings that the Company made as part of its rebuttal. I will also address this later in my testimony. In addition, the Company and the PUC Staff agree on many adjustments to operating revenue and expenses. The significant area of disagreement as it pertains to operating expenses is income taxes.
Q. Please summarize those areas of disagreements.
A. The area of disagreement are as follows:
(1) Use of Year End Rate Base

In its original rate filing the Company prepared rate base on a beginning and ending year average balance and then adjusted the balance to the year end ( $12 / 31 / 09$ ) balance. The PUC Staff requested and the Company provided the monthly balances for each of the rate base components. The PUC Staff then summed the 13 month balances and divided the 13 month balance by 13 to arrive at a 13 month average balance. The PUC Staff, as part of its rate base adjustments, then reversed the Company adjustment to derive the year end balance and replaced it with the 13 month average balance. The Company continues to believe that it is fair and reasonable to use year end balances. It believes so because it is now December 2011 and the permanent rate will not be finalized until some time in 2012. The 2009 rate base items have long been completed, in service and providing service to customers. The Company and the PUC Staff are in agreement that the 2010 additions to plant should be reflected at their year end balances. It would be inconceivable to the Company that its 2010 additions to plant will be fully reflected in rate base but its 2009 additions would not be, due to the average of the balances. This is also true of any plant related items such as accumulated depreciation, acquisition adjustments and CIAC, and the other rate base items. Also, the Company's investments consist largely of nonrevenue producing improvements. It is our understanding that the Commission has approved similar treatment in other cases, such as Unitil Energy Systems, Inc., 91 NH PUC 416 (2006).

## (2) Use of $\mathbf{1 2 \%}$ Return on Equity

The Company proposes a $12 \%$ return of equity due to increased financial risks associated with Company's utility plant and non-revenue generating capital requirements. See e.g. Appeal of PSNH, 130 N.H. 265 (1988) ("a just and reasonable rate is one which reflects, among other things, a rate of return "commensurate with returns on investments in other enterprises having corresponding risks."").

The basis for the Company's proposed return on equity is explained in the Testimony of Robert Montville and Thomas Mason. For certain investments, Staff proposed a reduced return on equity of $6 \%$, due to the Company's alleged failure to obtain lower cost debt financing. See Testimony of Jayson LaFlamme, Pages 8 \& 9. As explained in the Testimony of Thomas Mason, this lower cost debt financing was not reasonably
available. In addition, the cost of debt should not be used to lower the Company's cost on equity.

SPS Schedule lb therefore uses a $12 \%$ return on equity in order to provide an opportunity to earn a return that is commensurate with returns on investments in other enterprises, having corresponding risks to those facing Lakes Region Water Company.
(3) Adjustment to Retained Earnings to Reflect the Reduction for Pension and Health Insurance

In the original filing, which includes an adjusted test year of 2009, the Company incurred pension and health insurance expenses on behalf of its owners. The PUC Staff proposed reducing test year expenses for pension and health insurance expenses. After much discussion, the Company has accepted the need to reduce test year expenses for the pension and health insurance expenses. However, with the Company acceptance of the reduction, the PUC Staff did not make a corresponding adjustment to retained earnings. By reducing test year expenses, net income would increase by the same amount and net income closes into retained earning. Therefore, retained has to be adjusted for the reduction of the pension and health insurance expenses.

## (4) Adjustment for Federal Income Tax and State Business Tax

In the Company's filing, it used the standard federal tax rates applied to taxable income and $8.5 \%$ state business tax rate applied state business gross profits. Please note that federal taxable income between $\$ 100,000-\$ 335,000$ is taxed at $39 \%$. The Company just applied the standard methodology used by the Commission and its Staff in its and other past proceedings. However, the PUC Staff reduced the Company's income tax liability
to zero due to the availability of net operating losses that could be carried forward in future years to offset taxable income.

I disagree with the PUC Staff's adjustment for several reasons. First, in developing adjusted test year expenses, the Company is allowed to adjust test year expenses for known and measurable changes. One of the objectives of the rate case is to become profitable, to actually make some money instead of losing money. A consequence of becoming profitable, is realizing taxable income and paying income taxes.

The income tax expense from the Company's test year expenses unfairly punishes the Company for the losses it has incurred in prior years. This harms the Company and its customers by: (a) reducing the cash available to meet operating expenses and pay its debt obligations; (b) reducing the Company's opportunity to earn a reasonable return thereby accelerating the need for future rate relief, the costs of which are ultimately borne by the customers; and (c) reducing the Company's ability to re-invest capital in the water system, which is particularly acute due to the need to make large capital investments in non-revenue generating assets.

Second, the recognition of any difference between income tax expense and the amount of income tax paid is already recognized as a reduction to rate base. See JPL-1 Rate Base Deferred Taxes of $\$ 105,511$. While the Company is not advocating the removal of the deferred taxes from rate base, if the PUC Staff eliminates the income tax expense, then it should also eliminate the deferred taxes from rate base, since such deferred taxes are created from the timing difference between taxes incurred and taxes paid.

Third, by only allowing income taxes if such taxes are paid deviates from the accrual accounting from which the Company's books, financial statements and filing are prepared. Staff's adjustment focuses only on that one item.

As a result, the Effective Tax Factor is shown on SPS-1b and incorporated in the schedules.

## Q. Why is the Company concerned about access to capital in order to meet these requirements?

The Company is concerned about its access to capital because it has significant capital needs over the course of the next 5 years. While the Company has struggled financially, it has been approved by the State to access state revolving funds ("SRF"). After much consideration, the Company decided not to pursue the SRF because traditional rate making did not generate enough revenue to repay the loan. The recovery period of the assets was longer than the repayment of the loan. It is unreasonable to expect the Company to borrow funds and pay back such funds over 20 years when many of the assets are being recovered over 40-50 years. Their simply is not enough cash being received to pay the principal and interest on the loans. Its own bank, TD Bank, has not been willing to finance projects given the Company's present financial position.

> Mr. Naylor, in his testimony, raises the question "How will the Company address its pending capital needs if it is in such poor financial condition?" The answer is that the current rate case is intended to give the Company the opportunity to earn a return on and
recovery of its investments and to cover its ongoing operating expenses. The Company expects improved earnings in 2011 due to the PUC's approval of temporary rate in this rate case. The PUC Staff's revenue requirement level will allow the Company's financial condition to improve from poor to fair. The Company's revenue requirement level will allow the Company's financial condition to improve from poor to good.

While the Company expects its financial condition to improve, in order to address its pending capital needs, it needs the PUC to approve a 2012 step adjustment. The 2012 step adjustment is based on recovery of the Company 2011 and 2012 additions to plant. The Company has had discussion with its bank about such a financing and the bank has been willing to consider such a financing once permanent rates are approved and provided that there is an additional rate increase that enables the Company to pay back the loan. As such, the Company is proposing a step adjustment, which will allow for recovery of the investments over the life of the loan.

For the purpose for my testimony, I have assumed a term of 10 years for repayment of a loan to finance capital projects. As explained in Thomas Mason's testimony, the Company is willing to work with the parties on the projects, the financing and the recovery such that the revenues from the step adjustment would be placed in a separate account and such revenues would be used to pay principle and interest on the loan. The fundamental problem is not the Company's access to fund but its ability to generate enough revenue in order to pay the principal and interest on the debt. The 2012 step adjustment will solve that fundamental problem.

## Q. Please summarize your testimony.

A. The Company and the PUC Staff agree on more than we disagree on. The significant areas of disagreement are the year end versus 13 month average rate base, the $12 \%$ return on equity versus the $9.75 \% / 6.00 \%$, and the income taxes. It is important that the rate base reflect year end balances because such rate base balances are fully employed in the service to customers and as such the investment should be fully reflected. It is important that the return on equity recognize the risk of owning and operating a varied, geographically distant, multiple-satellite water system and its needs based on its physical and financial conditions. It is also important to allow income tax expense. It is the Company's hope and desire to become profitable at the conclusion of the rate case, to realize taxable income and to pay income taxes. As such, it is important that the Commission approve the Company's proposed combined revenue requirement from general customers of $\$ 1,045,185$. Equally important is the PUC approval of the 2012 step adjustment for the recovery of the 2011 and 2012 over the 10 year loan period. Approval of the Company's revenue requirement and the 2012 step adjustment will enable the Company to meet its present and future obligations.

## Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.

DW 10-141 and DW 11-021 LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. PERMANENT RATES
REVENUE REQUIREMENT

| Rate Base (Schedule 2) |  | 2,373,682 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rate of Return (Schedule 1a) | X | 9.62\% |
| Operating Income Requirement |  | 228,308 |
| Less: Proforma Test Year Operating Income (Schedule 3) |  | $(249,333)$ |
| Revenue Deficiency / (Surplus) Before Taxes |  | $(21,025)$ |
| Tax Factor (Schedule 1b) | $\div$ | 55.82\% |
| Revenue Deficiency / (Surplus) |  | $(37,669)$ |
| Add: Annual Water Revenues from General Customers Proposed by Company (Schedule 3) |  | 1,078,091 |
| Add: Staff Adjustments to Test Year Water Revenues from General Customers |  | $(19,046)$ |
| Annual Water Revenues from General Customers Proposed by Staff |  | 1,021,376 |
| Less: Adjusted Test Year Water Revenues from General Customers | (a) | $(784,397)$ |
| Proposed Increase in Annual Water Revenues from General Customers | \$ | 236,979 |
| Percent Increase in Annual Water Revenues from General Customers |  | 30.21\% |
| (a) Calculation of Adjusted Test Year Revenues from General Customers: |  |  |
| Co's Reported Test Year Revenues from General Customers | \$ | 766,032 |
| Additional Revenues from DW 08-070-Step 3 (See Sch 3a; Adj \# 24) |  | 25,224 |
| Staff Adjustment for Unearned Revenues (Sch 3a; Adj \# 25) |  | $(7,714)$ |
| Staff Adjustment for Unbilled Usage by Officers (Sch 3a; Adj \# 26) |  | 855 |
| Adjusted Test Year Water Revenues from General Customers |  | 784,397 |


(a) To reffect proposed conversion of Shareholder Loan to Additional Paid-in Capital per Co's fling in DW 11-021
(b) To reflect elimination of Additional Paid-in Capital relative to Co's proposed 2010 plant additions.
(c) Co's Shareholder Loan converted to Addrtional Paid-In Capital
salance of Shareholder Loan @ 12/31/09 (Schedule 1ai)
\$ 190,855
Less: Pension / Health Ins Payments to Shareholders duning test year (Per Co's response to Staff 3-12
(d) To reflect additional retained eamings due to elimination of Pension / Heath Ins to Shareholder
$\begin{array}{r}\quad(56,829) \\ \hline \$ \quad 134,026 \\ \hline\end{array}$


[^0]
## DW 10-141 and DW 11-021 <br> LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. <br> PERMANENT RATES <br> EFFECTIVE TAX FACTOR

| Taxable Income | $100.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Less: NH Business Profits Tax | $8.50 \%$ |
| Federal Taxable Income | $91.50 \%$ |
| Federal Income Tax Rate | $39.00 \%$ |
| Effective Federal Income Tax Rate | $35.69 \%$ |
| Add: NH Business Profits Tax | $8.50 \%$ |
| Effective Tax Rate | $44.19 \%$ |
| Percent of Income Available if No Tax | $100.00 \%$ |
| Effective Tax Rate | $44.19 \%$ |
| Percent Used as a Divisor in Determining |  |
| the Revenue Requirement | $5.8 .82 \%$ |
| Tax Multiplier |  |



## DW 10-141 and DW 11-021 <br> LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. <br> PERMANENT RATES <br> PRO-FORMA ADJUSTMENTS TO RATE BASE

Staff Adjstments

Rebuttal Adjustments

## Proforma Adjustments to Plant in Service:

## Plant in Service

1 To adjust Plant in Service rate base component from year-end avg to 13-month avg (Sch 2b).

2 To reverse Co's Rate Base Adj \# 1 in order to reflect the test year average of Plant in Service in rate base.

3 To reverse Co's Rate Base Adj \# 2 in order to remove proposed 2010 plant additions from test year rate base.
$(192,000)$

4 To adjust DW 08-070 - Step 3 Plant in Service (Sch 2c):
2008 Plant Additions per Staff: $\quad \$ 137,176$
Less: 2008 Plant Additions per Company:
$(145,217)$
2009 Plant Additions per Staff:
Less: 2009 Plant Additions per Company
77,214
Total Adjustment - 2009
To adjust to test year average

$+$

Total Adjustments - Plant in Service
$\$ \quad(295,824)$
\$
84,402

## Accumulated Depreciation

5 To adjust Accumulated Depreciation rate base component from year-end avg to 13-month avg (Sch 2b).

6 To reverse Co's Rate Base Adj \# 3 in order to reflect the test year average of Accumulated Depreciation in rate base.

7 To modify Co's Rate Base Adj \# 4 in order to reflect a test year average:
Co's Rate Base Adj \# 3 for additional half-year of Depreciation Expense $\quad \$ 6,293$ To adjust to test year average
$\div \quad 2$ 3,147

8 To reverse Co's Rate Base Adj \# 5 in order to remove accumulated depreciation on proposed 2010 plant additions from test year rate base.

3,634

9 To adjust DW 08-070 - Step 3 Accumulated Depreciation (Sch 2c):

2008 Accumulated Depreciation per Staff:
Less: 2008 Accumulated Depreciation per Company:
2009 Accumulated Depreciation per Staff:
Less: 2009 Accumulated Depreciation per Company
Total Adjustment - 2009
To adjust to test year average



## DW 10-141 and DW 11-021

## LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC.

## PERMANENT RATES

## PRO-FORMA ADJUSTMENTS TO RATE BASE

## Adj;

| Staff <br> Adjstments | Rebuttal <br> Adjustments |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$$ | $(446)$ | $\$$ | 446 |
|  | $(2,172)$ |  | 2,172 |
|  | 1,364 |  |  |
|  | $(1,254)$ | $\$$ | 2,618 |

Contributions in Aid of Construction (CIAC)
13 To adjust Contributions in Aid of Construction rate base component from year-end avg to 13 -month avg (Sch 2b).
$\$ \quad(3,846) \$ \quad 3,846$

Accumulated Amortization of CIAC
14 To adjust Accumulated Amortization of CIAC rate base component from year-end avg to 13 -month avg (Sch 2 b ).

| $\$$ | $(324)$ | $\$$ | 324 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $(8,456)$ |  |
|  |  |  | 8,456 |
|  |  | $(8,780)$ | $\$$ |

Proforma Adjustments to Working Capital:
Cash Working Capital
16 To adjust Cash Working Capital to amount computed by Staff (Sch 2b):
Adjusted Cash Working Capital computed by Staff (Sch 2b)
Less: Amount per Company Filing (See Sch 2; Col 1)

| $\$ 135,506$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $(165,248) \$ \quad(29,742)$ |

## Materials and Supplies

17 To adjust Materials and Supplies rate base component from year-end avg to 13-month avg (Sch 2b).
\$ 12,806 \$
$(12,806)$

18 To reflect prior year inventory adjustments in 13-month rate base average for Materials and Supplies:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Inventory Adj per Co Filing (Sch 1B; Pg } 2 \text { of 3; Adj \# 8) } \tag{10,500}
\end{equation*}
$$

|  |
| :---: |
|  |
| $\times \quad(11,375)$ |
| 0.9231 |

10,500

19 To reverse Co's Rate Base Adj \# 8 in order to reflect the test year average of Materials and Supplies in rate base.
14,217
$(14,217)$

# LRW EXHIBIT 5 

## DW 10-141 and DW 11-021 <br> LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. <br> PERMANENT RATES PRO-FORMA ADJUSTMENTS TO RATE BASE



DW 10-141 and DW 11-021
LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC.
PERMANENT RATES
COMPUTATION OF RATE BASE COMPONENTS -- 13-MONTH AVERAGE


## Calculation of Cash Working Capita:

Proforma Test Year O \& M Expenses (Sch 3)
\$ 753,672
Less: O \& M Expense for Tamworth
\$ $\quad(753,672) \mathrm{X}$
$101+1,616=$ $\qquad$
706.568
\& M Exp's for Systems that Bill in Arrears
75 Days / 365 Days
X $\quad 20.55 \%$
Cash Working Capital for Systems that Bill in Arrears
$\$ 145,185$

O \& M Expense for Tamworth
75 Days / 365 Days
Cash Working Capital for System that Bills in Advance

$$
(47,105)
$$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Net Cash Working Capital

> DW 10-141 and DW 11-021
> LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC.
> PERMANENT RATES
> ANALYSIS OF DW OB-070 STEP 3 PLANT ADDITONS and DEPRECIATION


[^1]DW 10-141 and DW 11-021

## REGION WATER COMPANY, INC.

PERMANENT RATES
OPERATING INCOME STATEMENT


## DW 10-141 and DW 11-021 <br> LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. PERMANENT RATES <br> PRO-FORMA ADJUSTMENTS TO OPERATING REVENUES AND EXPENSES

## Adj\#

## Proforma Adjustments to Operating Revenues:

## Sales of Water to General Customers

24 To modify Co's Operating Revenues Adj \# 1 to reflect actual amount realized from DW 08-070-Step 3:
Additional revenues realized by Co in DW 08-070 - Step 3 (Order \# 25,197) \$ 25,224
Less: Co's Operating Revenues Adj \# 1 per filing (Sch 1A; Pg 1 of 1; Adj \#1)
$(37,411) \$$
$(12,187)$

25 To adjust Co's test year revenues in order to properly reflect an unearned revenues adj per Co's response to Staff 3-5 and Staff-Tech 1-1.

26 To reflect additional revenues from unbilled usage by officers during the test year per Staff Audit Issue \# 6 and Co's response to Staff 3-4.

855

Total Adjustments - Sales of Water to General Customers
$\$ \quad(19,046)$

## Sales of Water - Special Contract

27 To adjust revenues received by the Company under the Special Contract with POASI per Co's response to Staff 3-3:
POASI rate calculation for 2010 per Co's response to Staff 3-3
Less: Co's pro-forma revenues from POASI per filing (see Sch 1A; Pg 1 of 1; Adj \# 2) $\begin{array}{r}\$ 125,978 \\ \hline\end{array}$

## Proforma Adjustments to Operating Expenses:

## Source of Supply Expenses

28 To increase purchased water expense for a prior period credit recorded during the test year per Staff Audit Issue \#7.
$\$$ 300

## Transmission \& Distribution Expenses

29 To reduce Equipment Lease expense for an unsubstantiated equipment rental cost per Staff Audit Report.
$\$ \quad(230)$

## Administrative \& General Expenses

To modify Co's O\&M Expense Adj \# 1 per Sch 3ci:
Test year wage adj per Staff (Sch 3ci; Col 9)
Less: Co's O\&M Expense Adj \# 1 per filing (Sch 1B; Pg 1 of 3; Adj \#1)
9,922
$(10,490)$

31 To adjust Co's O\&M Expense Adj \# 2 per Sch 3ci:
Test year wage adj per Staff (Sch 3ci; Col 14)
Less: Co's O\&M Expense Adj \# 2 per filing (Sch 1B; Pg 1 of 3; Adj \# 2)
$\$ 42,550$
$(20,597)$
21,953

32 To adjust Co's O\&M Expense Adj \# 4 per Sch 3ciii:
Test year health care expense adj per Staff (Sch 3ciii; Col 12) Less: Co's O\&M Expense Adj \# 4 per filing (Sch 1B; Pg 1 of 3; Adj \# 4)
\$ 17,919
$(24,983)$
$(7,064)$

## DW 10-141 and DW 11-021 LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. PERMANENT RATES <br> PRO-FORMA ADJUSTMENTS TO OPERATING REVENUES AND EXPENSES

## Adj\#

33 To eliminate pension payments to shareholders from test year operating expense per Staff 3-12.

34 To reduce Office Expense for prior period invoice recorded during the test year per Staff Audit Report.

35 To adjust Co's Outside Services - Accounting expenses:
Docket DW 07-105 costs deemed as non-recurring $\quad \$(1,365)$

Overcharged accounting fees per Staff Audit Issue \# 9
Docket DW 08-098 costs per Staff Audit Issue \# 10
Unsubstantiated accounting fees per Staff Audit Report

36 To adjust Co's Outside Services - Legal expenses:
Docket DW 07-105 costs deemed as non- recurring \$ (340)
General law expenses deemed relative to the Co's criminal case per Sch 3d.

37 To reduce Insurance Expense by amount of financing costs incurred during the test year per Staff Audit Issue \# 11.

38 To reduce Regulatory Commission Expense for publication of notice pertaining to financing that was not pursued per Staff Audit Report.

Total Adjustments - Administrative \& General Expenses
$\$(48,270)$

## Depreciation Expense

39 To adjust depreciation expense for DW 08-070 - Step 3 Plant in Service (Sch 2c):
Annual Depreciation Expense computed by Staff: \$ 7,071
Less: Annual Depreciation Expense computed by Co:
$(6,565)$ \$

40 To eliminate depreciation expense for assets retired during the test year per Staff 2-7.

41 To eliminate Co's Depreciation Expense Adj \# 13 relative to depreciation expense on 2010 plant additions.
$(7,268)$
$\$ \quad(24,718)$

Amortization of Acquistion Adiustment
42 To correct Amortization of Acquistion Adjustment expense per Staff Audit Issue \#5.
$\$ \quad(1,364)$

Amortization Expense - Other
43 To eliminate Co's Amortization Expense Adj \# 14 for expenses relative to the amortization of capital expenses.


Payroll Taxes

Attachment SPS-1
Schedule 3b

## DW 10-141 and DW 11-021 LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. PERMANENT RATES PROFORMA ADJUSTMENTS TO INCOME TAXES

## INCOME TAXES

To reflect the income tax effect of proforma adjustments to revenue and expenses
Total pro-forma adjustments to Water Revenues - General Customers
Total pro-forma adjustments to Water Revenues - Special Contract
Total pro-forma adjustments to Other Operating Revenues
Total pro-forma adjustments to Source of Supply Expense
Totai pro-forma adjustmens to Pumping Expense
Total pro-forma adjustments to Water Treatment Expense
Total pro-forma adjustments to Transmission \& Distribution Expense
Total pro-forma adjustments to Customer Accounts Expense
Total pro-forma adjustments to Administrative \& General Expense
Total pro-forma adjustments to Depreciation Expense
Total pro-forma adjustments to Amortization of CIAC
Total pro-forma adjustments to Amortization of Acquisition Adjustment
Total pro-forma adjustments to Amortization Expense - Other
Total pro-forma adjustments to Payroll Taxes
Total pro-forma adjustments to Property Taxes
Net Increase (Decrease) in Net Operating Income subject to State Income Tax
Less: New Hampshire Business Profits Tax @ 0.0\%
Less: New Hampshire Business Profits Tax @ 8.5\%
Net Increase (Decrease) in Net Operating Income subject to Federal Income Tax
Federal Income Tax @ 0.0\%
Federal Income Tax @39.0\%
State and Federal Tax Adjustment (Sch 3; Col 2)
To eliminate Co's proforma adjustment relative to Income Taxes (Sch 3; Col 2)
To adjust Co's Pro-forma NHBET Tax:
Pro-forma Wages per Sch 3ci, Col 13
Pro-forma Interest Expense per Sch 1ai; Col 15
Total
NHBET Rate
Pro-forma NHBET
Less: Test year NHBET (Sch 3; Col 1)

## PRO-FORMA ADJUSTMENTS NET OF INCOME TAXES

STAFF REBUTTAL
\$ $(19,046)$

230
48,270
24,718
1,364
1,841
$(2,488)$
$(3,179)$

48,827

|  | $(4,150)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 48,827 | 44,676 |
|  | $(17,424)$ |
| - | $(21,574)$ |
| 47,158 | $(47,158)$ |


| 274,440 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | 58,613 |
| \$ | 333,053 |
|  | 0.75\% |
| \$ | $(2,498)$ |
|  | 2,370 |

(128)
$95,857 \quad \$ \quad(68,732)$

DW 10-141 and DW 11-021
LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. PERMANENT RATES
COMPUTATION OF RATES

Proposed Annual Water Revenue from General Customers
\$ 1,021,376

Less: Annual Operating Revenue - WVG Community Pool
Current Authorized Rate Per Tariff
1 + Percentage Increase in Revenue Requirement

|  | $\$ 1,166.40$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\times$ | $1.3021 \quad(1,518.79)$ |

Less: Annual Operating Revenue - Non-metered Customers

Annual Water Revenue from General Customers less Annual Revenue - WVG Pool
Total Consolidated Rate Customers (including Gunstock Glen)
Annual Revenue Requirement per Customer
Total Non-metered Customers (including Gunstock Glen)
Annual Revenue Requirement Collected through Minimum Charge and Consumption Charge
\$ 1,019,857
$\div$ $\qquad$
\$ 631.88
X $\qquad$

Calculation of Metered Rate: $X+Y^{\star}(28,368 \mathrm{ccf}(\mathbf{a}) \div 1,040$ metered customers $)=$
\$ 631.88 charge per customer
( $\mathrm{X}=$ Minimum Charge; $\mathrm{Y}=$ Consumption Charge)
Calculation of Proportion of Present Minimum Charge to Present Consumption Charge:
Present Annual Minimum Charge Per Tariff: (X) \$373.23

Present Annual Consumption Charge Per Tariff (per 100 cu ft): (Y)
Proportion of Present Minimum Charge to Present Consumption Charge: $(X \div Y)$
$\div \$ 3.92$

Calculation of Consumption Charge:

| X | + | Y | * | 28,368 | $\div$ | 1,040 | $=$ | \$ 631.88 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Y | * | 95.2 | + | Y | * | 27.3 | $=$ | \$ 631.88 |
|  |  |  |  | Y | * | 122.5 | $=$ | \$ 631.88 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Y | $=$ | \$ 5.16 |

Annual Revenue Requirement Collected through Minimum Charge
28,368 =
\$ $(146,342)$

Calculation of Annual Minimum Charge:
$X+Y$.

| Y | 28,368 | $\div$ | 1,040 | $=$ | $\$ 631.88$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{X}+\$ 5.16$ | $*$ | 27.3 | $=$ | $\$ 631.88$ |  |
| X | + | $\$ 140.71$ | $=\$ 631.88$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 491.17$ | * 1,040

Remainder of Annual Water Revenue from General Customers
\$ 510,815
a Conversion of Metered Consumption from Gallons to CCF:
2009 Total Consumption by Metered Customers (Gallons)
Less: 2009 Suissevale Metered Consumption (Gallons)
2009 Consumption by Metered Customers subject to Step 3 (Gallons)
Conversion Factor from Gallons to CCF ( $1 \mathrm{CCF}=748.051948$ Gallons)
2009 Consumption by Metered Customers subject to Step 3 (CCF)

| $32,887,000$ Gallons |
| ---: |
| $(11,666,000)$ Gallons |
| $21,221,0 \mathrm{DM} 4$ |
| $\quad$Gallons |
| $\quad 748.05$ |
| Gallons |


|  | Attachment SPS-1 <br> Schedule 5 <br> DW 10-141 and DW 11-021 <br> LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC. <br> STEP ADJUSTMENT <br> REVENUE REQUIREMENT |
| :--- | ---: |


|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

DW 10-141 and DW 11-021
LAKES REGION WATER COMPANY, INC.
STEP ADJUSTMENT
REVENUE REQUIREMENT

(a) Calculation of Adiusted Test Year Revenues from General Customers:

Co's Reported Test Year Revenues from General Customers
Additional Revenues from DW 08-070-Step 3 (See Sch 3a; Adj \# 24)
\$ 766,032
Staff Adjustment for Unearned Revenues (Sch 3a; Adj \# 25)
Staff Adjustment for Unbilled Usage by Officers (Sch 3a; Adj \# 26)
Adjusted Test Year Water Revenues from General Customers
\$ 784,397 STEP ADJUSTMENT RATE OF RETURN

|  | Amount | Cost <br> Rate | Annual Interest | Annual Debt Cost | Total Annual Cost | Real Cost Rate | Weighted Average | Weighted Average Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ford Motor Credit | \$31,301 | 7.89\% | \$2,470 |  | \$2,470 | 7.89\% | 30.85\% | 2.43\% |
| Additional Paid in Capital (a) | $\underline{70,170}$ | 12.00\% |  |  |  | 12.00\% | 69.15\% | 8.30\% |
| Total Financing | \$101,471 |  | \$2,470 | \$0 | \$2,470 |  |  | 10.73\% |
| (a) Additional Paid in Capital: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 2010 Plant Additions |  |  |  | \$101,471 |  |  |  |  |
| Less: Ford Motor Credit Financing |  |  |  | $(31,301)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Paid in Capital |  |  |  | \$70,170 |  |  |  |  |

DW 10-141 and DW 11-021

## Lakes Region Water Company

2012 Step Adjustment
Revenue Requirement

## Calculation of Revenue Requirement

Addition to Rate Base:

| 2011 Additions | $\$ 184,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2012 Additions | $\underline{357,286}$ |
| Total Additions | $\$ 541,286$ |
| Less: Accumulated Depreciation (See Note A) | $\mathbf{2 7 , 0 6 4}$ |
| Net Plant | $\$ 514,222$ |
| Add: Cash Working Capital | $\$ 514,222$ |

Rate of Return $\quad 7.00 \%$
Additional Net Operating Income Required $\$ 35,996$
Add: Operating and Maintenance Expenses
Depreciation Expense 54,129
Amortization of CIAC
Assessed Property Value $\quad \$ 514,222 \quad 60.00 \% \quad \$ 308,533$
State Property Taxes (\$6.60/\$1,000) 2,036
Local Property Taxes (\$15.00/1,000) 4,628
PreTax Income $\quad \$ 96,788$
Federal Income Taxes (See Note B below) 0
Business Profit Taxes (See Note B below) $\underline{0}$
Total Additional Revenue Required $\quad \mathbf{\$ 9 6 , 7 8 8}$
Note: A
Total Additions $\$ 541,286$
Life of Loan 10
Half Year $\underline{2}$
Accumulated Depreciation \$27,064
Note: The assets are being depreciated over the life of the loan.
Note B:
PreTax Income $\quad \$ 96,788$
Operating Expenses 60,793
Interest Expenes $\quad \underline{36,662}$
NH Gross Business Profits (\$666)
NH Business Profits Taxes $\quad 8.50 \%$ O
Federal Taxable Income (\$666)
Federal Income Tax $39.00 \%$ O
Total Federal Income Taxes and State Business Profit Taxes \$0
SPSt. Cyr
12/9/2011


[^0]:    (a) To reflect proposed conversion of Sharethoder Loan to Additional Paid-in Capital per Co's fling in OW 11-021

[^1]:    (a) Retired plant netted against cost of additions were added back to cost of asset. (Based on Company's response to OCA DR $4-5$ in DW 08-070)
    b) Unsubstantiated costs per the 09/22/10 NHPUC Staff Audit Report in DW 08-070 were eliminated.
    (d) Asset not included in Step 3 in $\mathrm{OW} 08-070$. However, included in rate base for purposes of temporary rates less unsubstantated costs per the 09/22/10 NHPUC Staff Audit Report.

