FILED
November 25, 2024
INDIANA UTILITY
REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### STATE OF INDIANA

### INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF STUCKER FORK CONSERVANCY DISTRICT FOR APPROVAL OF A NEW SCHEDULE OF RATES AND CHARGES FOR WATER SERVICE

CAUSE NO.: 46167

### PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF DOUGLAS L. BALDESSARI, CPA

Prefiled Direct Testimony of Douglas L. Baldessari, CPA

Petitioner's Exhibit 3

Consulting Report on Cost of Service Study

Petitioner's Exhibit 4

Agreement Regarding Implementation of Cost of Service Study

Petitioner's Exhibit 5

Respectfully submitted

J. Christopher Janak, Atty. No. 18499-49

Jacob Antrim, Atty No. 36762-49

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP

111 Monument Circle, Suite 2700

Indianapolis, IN 46204

(317) 684-5000 | (317) 684-5173 Fax

cjanak@boselaw.com

jantrim@boselaw.com

Counsel for Stucker Fork Conservancy District

### Petitioner's Exhibit 3

#### **PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT 3**

#### STATE OF INDIANA

### INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF STUCKER FORK CONSERVANCY DISTRICT FOR APPROVAL OF A NEW SCHEDULE OF RATES AND CHARGES FOR WATER SERVICE

CAUSE NO.:	
------------	--

#### VERIFIED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

OF

DOUGLAS L. BALDESSARI, CPA

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER,
STUCKER FORK CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

2			<u>Introduction</u>				
3	1.	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.				
4		A.	My name is Douglas L. Baldessari and my business address is 8365 Keystone				
5			Crossing, Suite 300, Indianapolis, Indiana 46240-0458.				
6	2.	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR PROFESSION AND FOR WHO ARE YOU				
7			EMPLOYED?				
8		A.	I am a Certified Public Accountant and a principal in the firm of Baker Tilly				
9			Municipal Advisors, LLC ("BTMA"). BTMA is a registered municipal advisor				
10			with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") and controlled subsidiary				
11			of Baker Tilly Advisory Group, LP ("BTAG"), a tax and consulting firm.				
12			Additionally, I am a principal in Baker Tilly US, LLP ("BTUS") (collectively, with				
13			BTMA and BTAG, "Baker Tilly"), an assurance practice operating as a firm of				
14			certified public accountants.				
15	3.	Q.	CAN YOU DESCRIBE YOUR FIRM AND ITS AREA OF EXPERTISE?				
16		A.	The Baker Tilly entities collectively comprise a national full-service advisory, tax,				
17			and assurance practice of nearly 6,700 professionals across the country and				
18			internationally. In addition, Baker Tilly is an independent member of Baker Tilly				
19			International, the world's 10th largest network made up of 126 independent				
20			accounting and business services firms in 145 territories with 34,000 professionals.				
21			BTMA focuses exclusively on providing services to public sector organizations,				
22			including municipal utilities as independent municipal advisors and utility				
23			consultants. BTMA brings more than 65 years of experience in solid financial				

consulting and planning for governmental units, not-for-profit corporations and special districts and has resulted in completed projects and improved management and operations for utilities, municipalities, counties, schools, libraries, and other governmental units. A large part of our practice involves financial studies in connection with changes in utility rates and the financial planning associated with the acquisition of capital such as tax-exempt and taxable bonds and notes and other evidences of indebtedness.

#### 4. Q. WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE?

A.

A. In May 1991, I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Finance from the University of Connecticut, School of Business, Storrs, Connecticut. In August 2001, I received my Master of Professional Accountancy from Indiana University Kelly School of Business, Indianapolis, Indiana. Since then, I have completed various professional courses sponsored by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Indiana CPA Society, American Water Works Association, and other professional organizations.

## 5. Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.

I joined the firm of Umbaugh in March 2000 and, in 2002, completed the requirements to become licensed as a Certified Public Accountant in the State of Indiana. I became a Partner with the firm in January 2013. As a result of the combination with Baker Tilly and Springsted, I became a partner in Baker Tilly on March 1, 2019. During the past twenty four (24) years, I have been involved with

many professional engagements including financial studies for municipally-owned water and sewage utilities, not-for-profit water corporations, regional water and sewer districts, and conservancy districts. These studies quite often have involved the determination of utility revenue requirements, cost of service studies, and the financial planning associated with the issuance of tax-exempt and taxable bonds and loans.

### 6. Q. WHAT PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE YOU ASSOCIATED WITH?

I am a member of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, American Water Works Association, and Indiana Water Environment Association where I in the past have served on the Board of Directors and currently serve as the Junior WEF Delegate. In addition, our firm is a member of both the Indiana Rural Water Association and the Indiana Water and Wastewater Alliance.

### 7. Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED BEFORE AS AN EXPERT WITNESS?

A. Yes, I have testified before the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission ("Commission") on many occasions. My prior testimony has covered a myriad of topics, including, but not limited to, the development of appropriate revenue requirements, utility valuation, financing approval, and across-the-board and cost of service analysis and rate design.

A.

1 2			II.  Historical Relationship With Petitioner
3	8.	Q.	MR. BALDESSARI, HAS YOUR FIRM PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED ON
4			BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER, STUCKER FORK CONSERVANCY
5			DISTRICT ("PETITIONER" OR "STUCKER FORK")?
6		A.	Yes, our firm has represented Stucker Fork since its inception in 1964.
7	9.	Q.	CAN YOU DESCRIBE YOUR INVOLVEMENT AND THE NATURE OF
8			THE PROCEEDINGS IN STUCKER FORK'S FOUR PRIOR RATE
9			CASES, CAUSE NOS. 42752, 43780, 44164, AND 44687, AND 44987?
10		A.	Yes, I can. In Cause No. 42752, the Commission approved our cost of service study
11			and agreed with the Petitioner to "phase-in" the results of the cost of service study
12			to avoid rate shock for the Petitioner's large volume wholesale and industrial users.
13			In that Cause, Stucker Fork implemented the first phase of its cost of service study.
14			In Cause No. 43780, we prepared and presented a new cost of service study (using
15			the same methodology approved by the Commission in Cause No. 42752) and
16			requested that the Commission implement what would effectively be the
17			penultimate phase of the cost of service study. As part of the settlement agreement
18			in that case with the Office of Utility Consumer Counselor ("OUCC") (which was
19			ultimately approved by the Commission in its final Order), Stucker Fork was
20			required to use the cost of service study in Cause No. 43780 as the basis for making
21			a final move to cost based rates in its next rate case (i.e. Cause No. 44164).
22			In Cause No. 44164, the Petitioner proposed the final phase-in of cost of service-
23			based rates consistent with the requirement to follow or use the cost of service study

previously approved in Cause No. 43780. In its final Order, the Commission accepted the cost of service study but deferred the implementation of full cost-based 2 rates to the industrial and wholesale rate classes due to concerns of rate shock. The 3 Order also created requirements that the Petitioner must complete or meet before 4 preparing a new cost of service study. 5 In Cause No. 44687, the Petitioner proposed roll-in of the fully allocated cost of 6 7 service study to the industrial and wholesale rate classes previously approved in Cause Nos. 43780 and 44164, along with a small adjustment to other customer 8 classes necessary to support the revenue requirements. In its final Order, the 9 Commission accepted the final phase-in of cost of service-based rates, but also 10 reaffirmed the requirements from Cause No. 44164 that the Petitioner must 11 complete when preparing its next cost of service study. 12 In Cause No. 44987, the Petitioner requested an across the board increase in rates 13 and charges. A cost of service was not done at that time as there was changing 14 customer usage especially for the Petitioner's largest customer, Morgan Foods, Inc. 15 ("Morgan Foods"), during the test year and projects such as a recently completed 16 storage tank could have affected a cost of service study. It was anticipated that a 17 cost of service study could be performed for the Petitioner's next rate case. 18 TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, DID MORGAN FOODS INTERVENE AND 10. Q. 19 PARTICIPATE IN CAUSE NOS. 42752, 43780, 44164, 44687, and 44987? 20 Yes, Morgan Foods participated in all of Stucker Fork's above-referenced rate 21 A. cases. In a more recent case, Cause No. 44987, the settlement agreement reached 22

1

1		between the Petitioner, OUCC, and Morgan Foods requires the Petitioner to meet
2		with Morgan Foods prior to the Petitioner preparing and developing its next cost of
3		service study and that the Petitioner will provide Morgan Foods with written notice
4		prior to the Petitioner filing its next rate case. Counsel for the Petitioner contacted
5		Morgan Foods on August 29, 2024, seeking input regarding the cost of service
6		study. As will be described below, Stucker Fork and its consultants have had
7		multiple meetings and conversations with Morgan Foods and its consultants
8		regarding cost of service-related issues and Stucker Fork's anticipated request for
9		relief in this Cause.
10	11. Q.	HAS YOUR FIRM BEEN RETAINED BY THE PETITIONER IN
11		CONNECTION WITH THESE PROCEEDINGS?
12	A.	Yes. We were retained to conduct a cost of service study and propose additional
13		changes to Petitioner's present schedule of rates and charges for service that are
14		necessary to enable the Petitioner to adequately render service.
15 16		III. Need For Rate Adjustment
17	12. Q.	HAVE THE RESULTS OF YOUR ANALYSIS AND ADVICE TO THE
18		PETITIONER REGARDING THIS CAUSE BEEN REDUCED TO
19		WRITING?
20	Α.	Yes. Our firm prepared a consulting report dated November 21, 2024 ("Consulting
21		Report", Petitioner's Exhibit 4) summarizing the results of our studies.
22	13. Q.	GENERALLY SPEAKING, WHY IS THE PETITIONER SEEKING
23		RATE ADJUSTMENT?

1	A.	with the passage of time and changing of circumstances, a rate increase is now
2		necessary. The Petitioner's last rate increase was over 6 years ago, effective July
3		25, 2018, as approved by IURC Cause No. 44987. There has been substantial
4		inflationary pressure since then, driving up operation and maintenance expenses
5		including periodic maintenance expenses. Additionally, the Petitioner has been
6		planning for future capital needs of the Utility. As further described in this
7		testimony and exhibits, the Petitioner intends to issue bonds to expand its Marble
8		Hill Water Treatment Plant.
9	14. Q.	DO YOU BELIEVE YOUR PROPOSED ADJUSTMENTS FOR PERIODIC
10		MAINTENANCE EXPENSES AND OTHER ESTIMATED EXPENSES
11		ARE CONSISTENT WITH INDIANA CODE § 8-1-2-42.7(d)(2)?
12	A.	Yes, I do. While I am not an attorney, I understand that the Commission may adjust
13		historic test year amounts for items that are fixed, known, and measurable, as well
14		as for appropriate normalizations and annualizations. I view the higher periodic
15		maintenance expenses as being an appropriate normalization and annualization that
16		are also fixed, known, and measurable.
17 18		IV. Contents Of Consulting Report
19	15. Q.	WAS THE CONSULTING REPORT PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER
20		YOUR SUPERVISION?
21	Α.	Yes.

22

1	16. Q.	WHAT TEST YEAR WAS SELECTED FOR THE CONSULTING
2		REPORT?
3	Α.	The Consulting Report used the 12 months ended December 31, 2023 as the test
4		year.
5	17. Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY THE TEST YEAR ENDED MORE
6		THAN 270 DAYS PRIOR TO FILING THE CASE IN CHIEF AS
7		GENERALLY REQUIRED?
8	Α.	The test year selected is greater than 270 days old so that the Petitioner could
9		comply with the settlement agreement reached in Order 44987. In the settlement
10		agreement, the Petitioner agreed to meet with Morgan Foods to discuss cost of
11		service and rate design issues with the goal of avoiding protracted litigation over
12		these issues in the current rate case. The settlement required 60 days written notice
13		to Morgan Foods prior to filing the rate case. The Petitioner used this time to hold
14		multiple meetings with Morgan Foods. These meetings were fruitful resulting in a
15		settlement agreement between Morgan Foods and the Petitioner agreeing to the
16		cost-of-service methodology and phasing in of rates as further described in my
17		testimony. The test year ended December 31, 2023 together with the pro formation
18		adjustments, accurately reflects the pro forma annual revenue requirements of the
19		Petitioner and an updated test year period is not required.
20	18. Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CONSULTING REPORT TO
21		THE EXTENT NOT OTHERWISE SELF-EXPLANATORY?

The Consulting Report is divided into three sections. The first section of the 1 A. Consulting Report (pages 2 through 22) contains estimated financial information 2 based on the 12 months ended December 31, 2023, which was the test year used to 3 develop the estimated annual revenue requirements, along with a schedule of 4 estimated project costs and funding, the accompanying proposed bond amortization 5 schedule, and a proposed combined amortization schedule. 6 The second section of the Consulting Report (pages 23 to 7) contains the cost of 7 service study and resulting rates and charges. 8 The third section of the Consulting Report (pages 48 to 54) contains the proposed 9 phased-in cost of service study and the proposed rates and charges. 10 The fourth section of the Consulting Report (pages 55 to 64) contains supplemental 11 financial data, including account balances along with amortization schedules of the 12 outstanding waterworks bonds. 13 Pages 7 through 15 of the Consulting Report present the estimated annual operating 14 and maintenance expenses. Adjustments to test year expenses have been made for 15 fixed, known, and measurable items. The test year cash operating expenses have 16 been adjusted to reflect the cost of payroll adjustments, employee benefits, and 17 insurance, among others. Consistent with my earlier testimony, there are also 18 adjustments for the expected cost of periodic maintenance requirements. The 19 Petitioner has an expansive waterworks system ("Utility") extending over all or 20 portions of six counties including two water treatment plants, fifteen water tanks, 21 and a vast distribution system that all require substantial periodic maintenance. The 22

allowances for periodic maintenance expense have been updated by the Petitioner's 1 consulting engineers from those approved in Petitioner's prior rate case, Cause No. 2 44987. Other adjustments include the hiring of three new maintenance employees 3 needed to operate the Utility, and the retention of professional services for on-going 4 accounting support, financial reporting, and financial guidance. The test year cash 5 operating expenses of \$3,874,478 have been increased by \$280,657 to arrive at 6 estimated annual cash operating expenses of \$4,155,135. 7 The Petitioner's anticipated capital improvements needed in the immediate future 8 are shown on page 16. Per the consulting engineers, it is anticipated that the 9 Petitioner will spend almost \$13 million over the next 5 to 7 year period on a myriad 10 of capital improvement including work trucks, booster station switch gear, 11 expansion of the Marble Hill treatment plant, new Marble Hill supply wells, Austin 12 treatment plant raw water intake structure, and main replacement. These items do 13 not include the inevitable line breaks and other unexpected maintenance expenses 14 that typically occur. 15 As reflected on page 21, reference No. 6, the annual depreciation expense on the 16 Petitioner's facilities is \$990,030. Consistent with the Order in Cause No. 44164 17 (p. 16,  $\P$  10)<sup>1</sup>, the Petitioner is requesting a depreciation allowance of \$990,030 in 18 this proceeding which is, over time, a better and smoother guide to the Petitioner's 19 cash funded capital replacements and improvements. 20

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See also Commission Order in Cause No. 44687, p. 13-14; ¶4, entitled Extension and Replacements/Depreciation Expense, and Commission Order in Cause No. 44987, p. 4; ¶5B and 13; ¶12.

Page 17 is an estimated project cost and funding schedule for projects that the 1 Petitioner proposes to finance with a water revenue bond. The Petitioner is 2 proposing to finance the Marble Hill treatment plant expansion and new supply 3 wells, construction contingencies, IURC rate case expenses, and legal, bond 4 counsel, financial advisory, and general project contingencies totaling \$7,325,000 5 according to Mr. Richard Burch, the Petitioner's consulting engineer. While the 6 Commission does not approve debt issuance for conservancy districts, it is the 7 Petitioner's current plan to defer in issuing long-term debt to fund the proposed 8 projects until the Commission has issued an Order in this Cause. The Petitioner 9 was recently downgraded to an underlying S&P rating of "A-" on the Petitioner's 10 outstanding debt and the Petitioner could estimate stronger bond coverage with 11 additional revenues, and thus receive the best rating and interest rate possible. 12 Page 18 contains a proposed amortization scheduled for the proposed \$7,325,000 13 revenue bond issue at an assumed interest rate of 4.0%. The Petitioner anticipates 14 applying to fund the project through the State Revolving Fund ("SRF") Loan 15 Program in Spring 2025 to issue debt in SRF's next fiscal year, which is July 1, 16 2025, through June 30, 2026. Depending on SRF's Project Priority List ("PPL"), 17 the actual interest rates will depend on the current quarter's interest rate based on 18 the average residential user rate and MHI for the area. If the project does not score 19 well on the PPL, then the actual interest rates may be obtained through a 20 competitive sale of bonds. The proposed bonds have been amortized around the 21 Petitioner's currently outstanding bonds to achieve debt service that is as level as 22 23 practicable.

Pages 19 and 20 contain a proposed combined bond amortization schedule which 1 includes the outstanding and proposed debt service on the Petitioner's bonds. 2 A summary of the estimated revenue requirements of the Petitioner (determined on 3 the preceding schedules) is shown on page 21 with explanations of the adjustments 4 appearing on page 22. The revenue requirements have been adjusted to incorporate 5 the Petitioner's adjusted operation and maintenance expenses as shown on pages 7 6 through 15. Also included in the revenue requirements is the average annual debt 7 service on the outstanding bonds. The average annual debt service on the proposed 8 bonds as shown on page 18 has also been included, along with the associated debt 9 service reserve funding. Finally, an allowance for replacements and improvements 10 equal to the annual depreciation expense on the Petitioner's facilities is included 11 resulting in total revenue requirements of \$6,669,941. Total revenue requirements 12 are then reduced by test year interest income, penalties, and other income resulting 13 in net revenue requirements to be funded through rates of \$6,577,801. 14 In order to provide sufficient revenues to meet the estimated annual revenue 15 requirements, annual revenues of \$5,002,874, (which were adjusted to remove the 16 Washington Township settlement payment included in the wholesale water revenue 17 shown on page 21) would need to be increased by \$1,574,927, or approximately 18 31.5 percent across-the-board. 19 Beginning on page 23, the second section of the report contains the cost of service 20 analysis in which each of the revenue requirements are first allocated to the 21 functional cost categories, and then allocated to each customer classification based 22

1	upon each of the classes' responsibility for those functional costs. The allocated
2	cost of service for each customer classification is then used as a basis for developing
3	the fully allocated rates and charges. The method selected for use in allocating
4	costs is the base-extra capacity method promulgated by the AWWA.
5	Pages 23 - 24 lays out the test year consumer study including number of bills, usage,
6	and billings of the Petitioner's customers by meter size, usage block, and customer
7	class. Page 25 summarizes the consumer analysis and compares the calculated
8	billings to reported meter revenues which shows a 1.16% variance.
9	Page 26 summarizes the number of bills and billings of the Petitioner's fire
10	protection customers and compares them to the reported fire protection revenues
11	which shows a -2.22% variance. Overall, the calculated metered and fire protection
12	revenues compared with the recorded revenues results in a variance of 0.01%.
13	Page 27 presents the calculation of the estimated equivalent meters. Test year
14	average connections have been adjusted by the appropriate equivalency factor to
15	arrive at estimated equivalent connections.
16	Page 28 presents the calculation of the estimated equivalent fire hydrant
17	connections. Test year connections have been adjusted by the appropriate
18	equivalency ratio, based upon the sum of the squares methodology, to arrive at
19	estimated equivalent connections.
20	Summarized on page 29 of the report are the test year units of service for each
21	customer classification based upon information extracted from the utility's billing
22	records and capacity factors for each classification based upon capacity factors as

determined by the test year usage data and the consulting engineers. classifications include residential, commercial, industrial, government, and wholesale. The column entitled "Test Year Annual Sales" reflects the recorded billed consumption for each rate classification during the test year. The governmental test year annual sales have been normalized to remove usage for a major water leak on a customer premise and non-recurring usage from City of Scottsburg whose treatment operations were down for a portion of the test year. The total sales are used as the basis of allocating the base costs of service. For instance, during the test year, the average daily demand for service amounted to 3.583,000 gallons. The residential average demands amounted to 1,093,000 gallons or approximately 30 percent of the total average daily demand. Consequently, the residential users would be responsible for approximately 30.5 percent of the base costs of providing water service. The average daily demands for each rate classification have been multiplied by the extra capacity factors to determine the responsibility each customer class has for the extra capacity costs associated with meeting maximum day demands and maximum hour demands for service. For instance, the total maximum day demand has been calculated at 6,465,000 gallons per day. This exceeds the average day demand of 3,583,000 gallons and results in extra maximum day capacity of 2,882,000 gallons. The extra maximum day capacity of the residential customers amounts to 2,350,000 gallons per day, or approximately 36 percent of the total maximum day extra capacity. Accordingly, 36 percent of the costs related to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

meeting the extra maximum day demands for service are allocable to the residential 1 customers. The maximum hour demand has been calculated at a rate of 9,575,000 2 gallons per day. This capacity exceeds the average daily demands of 3,583,000 3 gallons and the extra capacity for maximum day demands of 6,465,000 gallons, 4 resulting in extra capacity for maximum hour demands of 3,110,000 gallons. 5 The number of bills for each customer classification that were obtained directly 6 from the billing records of the District was used as a basis for allocating customer 7 costs related to billing. The number of connections for each customer classification 8 has been weighted by equivalency factors to equate larger size meters to a standard 9 residential 5/8-inch water meter. These calculations are shown on page 27 of the 10 report. The equivalent connections for each customer classification are used as a 11 basis for allocating customer related costs associated with meters and services. 12 On pages 30 through 31 of the report, each of the recorded utility plant accounts at 13 December 31, 2023, has been allocated to the various functional cost categories 14 according to the methodologies described in the sixth edition of Principles of Water 15 Rates, Fees, and Charges, AWWA M1 Manual (the "AWWA Rates Manual.") The 16 functional categories include base costs of service, extra capacity costs for 17 maximum day and maximum hour demands, customer meters and services, and 18 direct fire protection service. 19 The allocated costs of utility plant are reduced by contributions to arrive at the 20 allocated net plant in service. The estimated revenues to be generated from rates in 21

excess of the estimated cash operating expenses have been allocated in ratio to the allocated net plant in service.

Pages 32 through 34 of the report contain the allocation of the estimated annual cash operating expenses to each of the functional cost categories. The estimated annual cash operating expenses have been obtained from pages 6 through 14 of the report. The total allocated cash operating expenses of \$4,155,135 are reduced by the estimated amount of funds available from other sources to arrive at the allocation of functionalized net cash operation and maintenance expenses. Once again, the allocations are based upon the methodologies and techniques described in the AWWA Rates Manual.

On page 35 the estimated costs of service, as allocated to each of the functional cost categories on the preceding pages, are divided by the units of service as calculated on page 29 to arrive at the estimated cost of service per unit. For example, page 32 of the report shows \$1,534,406 of the net cash operation and maintenance expenses as being allocable to the base cost of service. Page 35 also shows \$650,987 of the debt service and debt service reserve allowances along with \$422,683 of the estimated annual allowance for replacements and improvements being allocable to the base cost of service. In total, \$2,608,076 of estimated costs of service to be recovered through rates is allocable to base cost. Dividing these allocated base costs by the recorded test year billed usage results in an estimated base cost of service of approximately \$1.9940 per unit of service.

21

The Petitioner provides fire protection service to only those customers in the City of Austin, Indiana ("Austin"). Based upon this information we allocated the fire protection costs using the Maine Public Utilities Association Commission's methodology as described in the AWWA Rates Manual. Using this methodology we have calculated that 26.0% of the inside Austin revenues would be allocated to fire protection service.

On page 36 the cost of service per unit is then applied to the corresponding units for each customer classification as developed on page 29 to arrive at each customer classes' responsibility for those functional costs. For example, applying the base cost of service of \$1,9940 per unit of service to the recorded billed consumption of the residential users arrives at a base cost of service for the residential users of \$795,438. Applying the cost of service per unit for maximum day extra capacity of \$540.3109 to the residential units of service allocates \$679,171 of extra capacity maximum day costs to residential users. The sum of each customer classifications responsibility for each of the functional cost categories equals the total allocated cost of service for each customer classification. Of the \$6,577,801 of total estimated revenue requirements to be provided through rates and charges, \$2,999,621 are allocable to residential customers, or 45.60 percent, \$145,392 are allocable to the commercial customers, or 2.21 percent, \$1,889,800 are allocable to industrial customers, or 28.73 percent, \$67,253 are allocable to government customers, or 1.02 percent, \$1,251,349 are allocable to the wholesale customers, or

# Testimony of Douglas L. Baldessari, CPA <u>Petitioner's Exhibit 3</u> Stucker Fork Conservancy District Page 18

1		19.03 percent, with the remaining \$224,386, or 3.41 percent, allocable to fire
2		protection.
3		Page 37 calculates the monthly base charge by meter size. The meter cost per unit
4		is adjusted based on the appropriate equivalency factor for each meter size and then
5		added to the billing cost per unit to arrive at the monthly base charge.
6		Page 38 calculates the fully allocated fire hydrant and sprinkler charges. Although
7		the District currently only provides private fire protection service for 6, 8, 10, and
8	ŧ.	12-inch connections, we have calculated automatic sprinkler charges for various
9	j	connection sizes using the sum of the squares methodology.
10	Í	The calculation of equivalent connections for public fire protection is shown on
11		page 39. This schedule converts the number of inside-the-city of Austin customers
12		to total equivalent connections based on each customer's meter size ratio to a 5/8"
13		meter.
14		Page 40 calculates the portion of the total allocated cost of service for fire protection
15	5	that is to be recovered through public fire protection charges. That amount is then
16	i	divided by the total equivalent connections to calculate the proposed annual and
17		monthly charge per equivalent connection. Page 41 then goes on to demonstrate
18	3	that the proposed charge per connection is sufficient to recover the allocated cost
19	)	of service.
20	)	On page 42, the proposed annual charge per meter size for public fire protection is
21		divided by twelve months to determine the proposed monthly charge per meter size.

22

Page 43 of the report compares the fully allocated cost of service as determined on 1 page 36 with the annual revenue anticipated to be generated under the adjusted rates 2 and charges for each customer classification. 3 Page 44 of the report shows the calculation of the estimated annual revenues for 4 each rate classification at the proposed rates and charges. 5 Page 45 compares typical monthly bills for various meter sizes and various levels 6 of water usage under present and adjusted rates if the Petitioner were to implement 7 the fully allocated cost of service study. 8 Pages 46 and 47 of the report summarize the water rates and charges that would 9 result based upon the fully allocated cost of service. The rates proposed for 10 residential, commercial, industrial, and governmental users consist of a two-part 11 rate. The first part of the rate consists of a monthly service charge based upon the 12 size of the meter installed with the larger size meters bearing a greater share of the 13 cost. The second component of the retail rate consists of a volume charge which is 14 a metered block rate for each 1,000 gallons of water used each month. Based on 15 the fully allocated cost of service, the rate blocks begin with a rate of \$5.10 per 16 1,000 gallons for the first 10,000 gallons of water used each month, declining to a 17 18 proposed rate of \$4.74 per 1,000 gallons for the next 240,000 gallons of water used each month, declining to a proposed rate of \$3.95 per 1,000 gallons for the next 19 250,000 gallons of water used each month, and a final rate block declining to a 20 proposed rate of \$3.55 per 1,000 gallons for usage in excess of 500,000 gallons per 21 month. The wholesale rate consists of a volumetric charge per 1,000 gallons of 22

water consumed. The public fire protection charge is billed monthly to the Austin 1 customers. Private fire protection charges are billed annually. 2 Beginning on page 48, the third section of the report contains the analysis where 3 the allocated costs of service for each customer classification, as determined on 4 page 36, will be used as a basis for developing the adjusted (phased-in) rates and 5 6 charges. Over time, it is common for inequities in water rates and charges to develop that 7 result in one customer class subsidizing another. The various customer 8 classifications place different demands on a water system. Consequently, as 9 customers are connected (particularly large customers) and as improvements are 10 made, the cost of providing service to each class will vary. This situation was 11 exacerbated by the fact Petitioner has not had a cost of service study since Cause 12 No. 44687, for which an Order was approved on December 14, 2016. After 13 multiple meetings, Stucker Fork and Morgan Foods agreed that the elimination of 14 the rate subsidies would be phased in over time. 15 As summarized on page 48, the adjusted cost of service revenues are compared to 16 the allocated cost of service for the industrial and wholesale customers. The 17 difference between the allocated cost of service and the revenues under the existing 18 rates represents the subsidy that currently exists between the industrial and 19 wholesale customers and the residential and governmental customers. In effect, the 20 residential and government customers are paying more than their allocated cost of 21 service to subsidize or lower the rates of the industrial and wholesale customers. 22

## Testimony of Douglas L. Baldessari, CPA <u>Petitioner's Exhibit 3</u> Stucker Fork Conservancy District Page 21

the subsidies over the course of the next two general rate adjustments including the current cause. Consequently, the additional proposed revenues to be generated from the industrial and wholesale customers are comprised by eliminating fifty percent of the now existing, calculated subsidy. Any revenues in excess of test year levels necessary to satisfy the estimated revenue requirements are going to continue to be provided by the residential and government customers until the subsidies are fully eliminated as part of the Petitioner's next Cause. Page 49 calculates the adjusted cost of service for industrial and wholesale customers by adding the test year revenues with the revenues generated from the fifty percent reallocation of the existing subsidies calculated on page 48. Residential and government customers are allocated the additional revenues that are required to satisfy the estimated revenue requirements. Page 50 of the report compares the adjusted allocated cost of service as determined on page 49 with the normalized annual revenue generated under the existing rates and charges for each customer classification. The schedule indicates that at the present rates the residential users are presently providing about 77 percent of their adjusted cost of service. The commercial customers are providing approximately 75 percent of their adjusted cost of service. The government customers are providing approximately 97 percent of their adjusted cost of service and fire protection provides 91 percent of its adjusted cost of service. The industrial and wholesale customers are providing only 73 percent of their adjusted cost of service.

But, because of the magnitude of the subsidies, the Petitioner proposes to eliminate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	In total, the existing rates and charges recover about 76 percent of the total cost of
2	service given the District's current revenue requirements.
3	To achieve the adjusted, cost-based targets, residential revenues must be increased
4	29.31%, commercial customers' rates must be increased by 33.50%, industrial
5	customers' rates must be increased by 36.62%, government customers' rates must
6	be increased by 3.25%, wholesale customers' rates must be increased by 36.54%
7	and fire protection rates must be increased by 9.91%. Overall, this results in the
8	31.48% overall increase in revenues.
9	Page 50 of the report also compares the estimated revenue to be generated under
10	the proposed rates for each rate classification with the allocated adjusted cost of
11	service for each customer classification. As indicated in the schedule, the proposed
12	rates would provide approximately 99.97 percent of the required residential
13	customers, 103.75 percent of the required revenue from the commercial customers,
14	100.00 percent of the required revenue from the industrial customers, 96.33 percent
15	of the required revenue from the government customers, 99.83 percent of the
16	required revenue from wholesale customers, and 100.00 percent of the required
17	revenue from the fire protection customers.
18	Page 51 of the report shows the calculation of the estimated annual revenues for
19	each rate classification at the proposed rates and charges.
20	Page 52 compares typical monthly bills for various meter sizes and various levels
21	of water usage under present and proposed rates.

Pages 53 and 54 of the report summarize the proposed water rates and charges. The rates proposed for residential, commercial, government and industrial users consist of a two-part rate. The first part of the rate consists of a monthly service charge based upon the size of the meter installed with the larger size meters bearing a greater share of the cost. The second component of the retail rate consists of a volume charge which is a metered block rate for each 1,000 gallons of water used each month. The rate blocks begin with a rate of \$5.42 per 1,000 gallons for the first 10,000 gallons water used each month, declining to a proposed rate of \$3.41 per 1,000 gallons for usage in excess of 500,000 gallons per month. The wholesale rate consists of volumetric charge per 1,000 gallons of water consumed. The public fire protection charge is billed monthly to the Austin customers. Private fire protection charges are billed annually. The third section of the Consulting Report contains supplemental financial data starting on page 55. Pages 55 and 56 compare the account balances of the Petitioner as of December 31, 2023, with the minimum balances either required to be maintained by the outstanding resolution in effect with respect to the Petitioner's outstanding long-term indebtedness or is typically maintained by public utilities such as the Petitioner, including a separate restricted account for periodic maintenance expense monies. The amortization schedules of the outstanding 2014 Refunding Bonds, 2014 Bonds, 2017 Bonds, 2020 Refunding Bonds, and 2020 Taxable Bonds are shown on pages 57 through 62. Pages 63 and 64 show the schedule of combined amortization.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

19. Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE THE EXPLANATION OF THE CONSULTING REPORT?

1	Α.	Yes, it does.
2		V. Agreement with Morgan Foods
4	20. Q.	HAS STUCKER FORK MET WITH MORGAN FOODS REGARDING THE
5		PROPOSED COST OF SERVICE STUDY IN THIS CAUSE?
6	Α.	Yes, Stucker Fork has met with Morgan Foods on multiple occasions regarding cost
7		of service-related issues. These meetings have resulted in an Agreement Regarding
8		Implementation of Cost of Service Study ("COSS Agreement"), a copy of which is
9		attached hereto as Petitioner's Exhibit 5.
10	21. Q.	CAN YOU BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE COSS AGREEMENT BETWEEN
11		STUCKER FORK AND MORGAN FOODS?
12	Α.	Yes, I can. Stucker Fork and Morgan Foods have agreed to a methodology for the
13		cost of service study which allocates the costs of providing service to Stucker
14		Fork's different customer classes. In an effort to avoid rate shock for Morgan Foods
15		and other large users, Stucker Fork has agreed to implement the cost of service
16		results in two (2) phases. Based on the COSS Agreement, fifty percent (50%) of
17		the cost of service increase beyond the across-the-board increase will be
18		implemented in this Cause and the remaining fifty percent (50%) would be
19		implemented in five (5) years or in Stucker Fork's next rate case, whichever occurs
20		later.
21	22. Q.	DO YOU THINK THIS COSS AGREEMENT IS FAIR AND REASONABLE
22		FOR MORGAN FOODS AND STUCKER FORK'S OTHER CUSTOMER
23		CLASSES?

Yes, I believe the COSS Agreement is fair and reasonable for Stucker Fork, Morgan Foods, and Stucker Fork's remaining customers. In prior rate cases, Stucker Fork, Morgan Foods, the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, and this Commission have spent significant resources in litigating and deciding cost of service issues. At a minimum, the COSS Agreement eliminates any cost of service-related issues between Stucker Fork and Morgan Foods which should reduce the amount of resources expended by all the parties involved. In addition, the COSS Agreement adopts the Commission's long-accepted principal of "gradualism" in that the full amount of the proposed cost of service will be phased in over time to avoid rate shock to Morgan Foods and other large volume users. Finally, I believe the COSS Agreement is fair and reasonable in that the proposed rates arising out of such agreement are based upon the methodology set forth in the AWWA Rates Manual which has long been accepted by the Commission as an appropriate means of establishing cost-based rates for Indiana utilities.

A.

A.

### VI. Relief Requested and Bases for Same

### 23. Q. MR. BALDESSARI, HAVE YOU INCLUDED AN AMOUNT IN YOUR CONSULTING REPORT FOR RATE CASE EXPENSE?

Yes, I have. I have included \$325,000 for rate case expenses to be financed with the proposed 2025 Bonds. As noted on page 17 of the Consulting Report, actual rate case expenses for Cause No. 44164, 44687, and 44987 were \$467,768.64, \$367,481.70, and \$317,060.47, respectively. The most recent case, Cause No. 44987, did not include the preparation of a cost of service study. In Cause No.

44164 and 44687, which included cost of service issues, the amount of rate case expensed exceeds the estimate of \$325,000. Based on preparing a cost of service study, complexations of the case, the likelihood of an intervenor, and my 24 years of experience in working on similar cases, I believe that \$325,000 is a reasonable estimate assuming there is not extensive discovery and the rate case is not too protracted.

A.

A.

### 24. Q. CAN YOU DESCRIBE THE TASKS THAT YOU CONSIDERED WHEN ESTABLISHING THE RATE CASE EXPENSE?

Yes. As with many clients, the process for adjusting rates and seeking Commission approval for the same remained relatively unchanged. As in prior cases, I, along with my fellow professionals, met with the Board; discussed and developed options to meet the Board's needs; prepared consulting reports, ordinances, resolutions, engineering reports, and capital improvement plans; provided our findings to Morgan Foods; and prepared and pre-filed testimony and exhibits. I also anticipate that we will respond to discovery and assist in filing all proposed orders and items in the cause.

### 25. Q. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THE ADJUSTMENT FOR THREE (3) NEW EMPLOYEES AND THE NEED FOR SAME?

Yes, I can. As noted previously in my testimony, I have offered an adjustment to test year expense to include three (3) new employees. Those new employees will be assigned to maintenance of the water treatment plants and distribution system. The need for these employees are to cover vacant positions that were terminated

Testimony of Douglas L. Baldessari, CPA

<u>Petitioner's Exhibit 3</u>

Stucker Fork Conservancy District

Page 27

1		prior to the test year. In calculating the adjustment for the three employees, we			
2		have met with the Petitioner's management to determine an amount for salaries and			
3	benefits that is appropriate and reasonable for the respective positions.				
4	26. Q.	IS IT YOUR OPINION THAT THE RATES PROPOSED IN YOUR			
5		CONSULTING REPORT ARE FAIR, JUST, NON-DISCRIMINATORY			
6		AND REASONABLE AND NECESSARY TO MEET THE PROJECTED			
7		REVENUE REQUIREMENTS OF THE UTILITY?			
8	A.	Yes, it is my opinion they are.			
9	27. Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS CAUSE?			
10	Α.	Yes, it does.			
11					

### VERIFICATION

I affirm under the penalties of perjury that the foregoing testimony is true to the best of my

knowledge, information, and belief as of the date here filed.

Douglas L. Baldessari, CPA

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been served upon the following counsel of record via electronic mail this 25th day of November, 2024:

Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor infomgt@oucc.in.gov

Christopher Janak

Bose McKinney & Evans LLP 111 Monument Circle, Suite 2700 Indianapolis, IN 46204 (317) 684-5000 Telephone (317) 684-5173 Facsimile

4887704.3

### Petitioner's Exhibit 4

Petitioner	90	Ext	ihi	1
1 cultonel	13	LINE	***	

IURC Cause No.\_\_\_\_

Stucker Fork Conservancy District Water Utility

> Consulting Report On Cost of Service Study

> > November 21, 2024

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Page(s)

### **ESTIMATED INFORMATION**

2 - 6	General Comments
7 - 15	Estimated Annual Operation and Maintenance Expenses
16	Capital Improvement Plan
17	Schedule of Estimated Project Costs and Funding
18	Schedule of Amortization of \$7,325,000 Principal Amount of
	Proposed Waterworks Revenue Bonds, Series 2025
19 - 20	Schedule of Proposed Combined Bond Amortization
21 - 22	Estimated Annual Revenue Requirements and Annual Revenues

### COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

23 - 24	Consumer Analysis of Test Year
25	Consumer Analysis Summary
26	Fire Protection Consumer Analysis Test Year
27	Calculation of Test Year Equivalent Meters
28	Calculation of Equivalent Fire Hydrant Connections
29	Test Year Units of Service
30 - 31	Allocation of Utility Plant to Functional Cost Components
32 - 34	Allocation of Estimated Cash Operation and Maintenance
	Expenses to Functional Cost Components
35	Unit Costs of Service
36	Cost of Service Allocated to Customer Classes
37	Calculation of Proposed Monthly Service Charges
38	Calculation of Fire Protection Charges Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service
39	Calculation of Equivalent Connections for Public Fire Protection
40	Calculation of Public Fire Protection Charge per Equivalent Connection Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service
41	Allocation of Annual Public Fire Protection Revenue by Meter Size
42	Summary of Monthly Public Fire Protection Charges Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service
43	Comparison of Allocated Cost of Service with Revenue Under Adjusted Rates
44	Estimated Annual Operating Revenue at Adjusted Rates and Charges Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service
45	Comparison of Present and Adjusted Monthly Bills at Selected Usage Amounts Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service
46 - 47	Summary of Adjusted Water Rates and Charges Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service

(Continued on next page)

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Cont'd)

### Page(s)

### COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS - PHASED-IN

48	Calculation of Subsidy to be Phased Out
49	Calculation of Adjusted Cost of Service
50	Comparison of Adjusted Cost of Service with Revenue Under Proposed Rates
51	Estimated Annual Operating Revenue at Proposed Rates and Charges
52	Comparison of Present and Proposed Monthly Bills at Selected Usage Amounts Based Upon Adjusted Cost of Service
53 - 54	Summary of Present and Proposed Water Rates and Charges

### SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCIAL DATA

55 - 56	Comparison of Account Balances with Minimum Balances Required
57	Schedule of Amortization of \$835,000 Principal Amount of
	Outstanding Waterworks Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2014
58	Schedule of Amortization of \$4,000,000 Principal Amount of
	Outstanding Waterworks Revenue Bonds, Series 2014
59	Schedule of Amortization of \$2,475,000 Principal Amount of
	Outstanding Waterworks Revenue Bonds, Series 2017
60	Schedule of Amortization of \$4,285,000 Principal Amount of
	Outstanding Waterworks Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2020
61 - 62	Schedule of Amortization of \$2,341,000 Principal Amount of
	Outstanding Taxable Waterworks Revenue Bonds, Series 2020
63 - 64	Schedule of Combined Bond Amortization



November 21, 2024

Board of Directors Stucker Fork Conservancy District Water Utility 2260 North U.S. 31 Austin, IN 47102 Baker Tilly Municipal Advisors, LLC 8365 Keystone Crossing, Suite 300 Indianapolis, IN 46240 United States of America

T: +1 (317) 465 1500 F: +1 (317) 465 1550 bakertilly.com

In connection with the Stucker Fork Conservancy District Water Utility's proposed adjustments to water rates and charges, we have at your request, prepared this special purpose report for submission to the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission.

This report has been prepared for the purpose of requesting approval of adjustments to water rates and charges by the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission and should not be used for any other purpose.

In the preparation of these schedules, assumptions were made as noted regarding certain future events. As is the case with such assumptions regarding future events and transactions, some or all may not occur as expected, and the resulting differences could be material. We have no responsibility to prepare subsequent reports or update the schedules.

Baker Tilly Municipal Advisors, LLC

**ESTIMATED INFORMATION** 

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

The Stucker Fork Conservancy District Water Utility (the District), an Indiana conservancy district, was organized in 1964 and provides potable water services to approximately 8,000 residential, commercial, industrial and wholesale customers. The service area includes the Town of Austin and portions of Scott, Jefferson, Jackson, Jennings, Washington, and Clark counties.

The water rates being proposed are based upon the results of a cost of service study utilizing the base-extra capacity method, to provide sufficient revenues for the anticipated expenses of operation and maintenance, to provide for the payment of principal and interest on the existing bonds and to provide for capital improvements. The Board of Directors of the District proposes to increase water rates and charges subject to the approval of the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (the IURC).

#### ESTIMATED INFORMATION

#### Estimated Annual Operation and Maintenance Expenses – Pages 7 - 15

The recorded operating expenses for the twelve months ended December 31, 2023 (the Test Year) have been adjusted for fixed, known and measurable changes as explained on pages 7 through 15 to arrive at estimated annual operating expenses. Significant among the adjustments are those for periodic maintenance requirements, capital and non-recurring items and rate case costs.

#### Capital Improvement Plan - Page 16

Page 16 details the anticipated capital improvements over the next five years as provided by the District's consulting engineers. This information is presented for information only as the District's proposed revenue requirement is based upon the allowance for depreciation.

#### Schedule of Estimated Project Costs and Funding - Page 17

This schedule shows the estimated construction costs, non-Construction costs for the Marble Hill WTP expansion project to be funded through the Proposed Waterworks Revenue Bonds, Series 2025 (the Proposed 2025 Bonds).

#### Schedule of Amortization of \$7,325,000 Principal Amount of Proposed Waterworks Revenue Bonds, Series 2025 – Page 18

This schedule shows the amortization of the Proposed 2025 Bonds and annual debt service with the assumed interest rate of 4%, based on the SRF pooled interest rate in spring 2024.

#### Schedule of Proposed Combined Bond Amortization - Pages 19 - 20

This schedule shows the combined bond amortization of the Outstanding and Proposed 2025 Bonds.

(Cont'd)

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

#### Estimated Annual Revenue Requirements and Annual Revenues - Pages 21 - 22

The recorded Test Year operating expenses have been adjusted for fixed, known and measurable changes as explained on pages 7 to 15 to arrive at the estimated annual operating expenses. The annual debt service requirement reflects estimated average annual principal and interest payments for five years ending January 1, 2031 on the outstanding and Proposed 2025 Bonds The allowance for replacements and improvements is equal to the annual depreciation allowance to fund the capital improvement plan and arrive at the total revenue requirements. The total revenue requirements are reduced for test year interest income, penalties, and other revenues to arrive at net revenue requirements.

#### COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

#### Consumer Analysis of Test Year - Pages 23 - 24

Shows the number of bills, usage, and billings of the District's customers by meter size, usage block, and customer class.

#### Consumer Analysis Summary - Page 25

Summarizes the consumer analysis by customer class and compares the calculated billings to reported meter revenues.

#### Fire Protection Consumer Analysis Summary - Page 26

Summarizes the number of bills and billings of the District's fire protection customers and compared to reported fire protection revenues.

#### Calculation of Test Year Equivalent Meters - Page 27

Based upon the test year analysis of water billings, the equivalent meters are calculated on this schedule. The equivalent meters are used in the allocation of costs associated with customer meters and services.

#### Calculation of Equivalent Fire Hydrant Connections - Page 28

Based upon the test year analysis of fire hydrant billings, the equivalent fire connections are calculated on this schedule. The equivalent fire connections are used in the allocation of costs associated with fire connections.

(Cont'd)

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

#### Test Year Units of Service - Page 29

This schedule calculates the demand allocation factors and summarizes the monthly bills and equivalent monthly bills. The calculation of demand allocation factors was made using the base-extra-capacity method. The capacity factors as presented on this schedule were determined with the assistance of the consulting engineers.

#### Allocation of Utility Plant to Functional Cost Components - Pages 30 - 31

With the assistance of the consulting engineers, the various functional elements of utility plant in service have been allocated to the various functional cost components based upon the demand allocation factors on the preceding page and upon the methodologies described in the American Water Works Association (AWWA) Water Rates Manual, as shown on this schedule.

### Allocation of Estimated Cash Operation and Maintenance Expenses to Functional Cost Components - Pages 32 - 34

Estimated annual operation and maintenance expenses are allocated to the functional cost categories with the assistance of the consulting engineers as explained on this schedule.

#### Unit Costs of Service - Page 35

This schedule calculates the unit costs of service for each function of the waterworks facilities.

#### Cost of Service Allocated to Customer Classes - Page 36

Unit costs of service determined on the preceding schedules, when applied to units of service by customer class, calculate the total costs of service for each customer class.

#### Calculation of Proposed Monthly Service Charges - Page 37

This schedule calculates the monthly base charge proposed to be applicable to each meter size.

#### Calculation of Fire Protection Charges Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service - Page 38

This schedule calculates the private fire protection charges based upon equivalent fire connections for fully allocated cost of service.

#### Calculation of Equivalent Connections for Public Fire Protection - Page 39

This schedule calculates the total equivalent connections of those users who benefit from public fire protection.

(Cont'd)

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

<u>Calculation of Public Fire Protection Charge per Equivalent Connection Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service - Page 40</u>

This schedule calculates total revenues to be recovered from public fire protection charges and the resulting proposed monthly charge per equivalent connection.

Allocation of Annual Public Fire Protection Revenue by Meter Size - Page 41

This schedule calculates the proposed annual charge per connection by meter size and confirms that the annual revenues required are being met.

Summary of Monthly Public Fire Protection Charges Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service - Page 42

This schedule calculates the proposed monthly public fire protection charge by meter size.

Comparison of Allocated Cost of Service with Revenue Under Adjusted Rates - Page 43

This schedule compares the revenues, by user class, generated by adjusted rates with the fully allocated cost of service.

Estimated Annual Operating Revenue at Adjusted Rates and Charges Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service - Page 44

This schedule summarizes the calculations used to determine the projected revenues at adjusted rates assuming the fully allocated cost of service.

Comparison of Present and Adjusted Monthly Bills at Selected Usage Amounts Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service - Page 45

The adjusted rates are compared with the existing rates for various water usage amounts, meter sizes, and wholesale users on this schedule.

Summary of Adjusted Water Rates and Charges Based Upon Allocated Cost of Service Charges - Pages 46 - 47

The adjusted rates and charges, based upon the fully allocated cost of service, as calculated on the preceding schedules are summarized on this page and presented alongside the present rates and charges.

(Cont'd)

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

#### COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS - PHASED-IN

#### Calculation of Subsidy to be Phased Out - Page 48

This schedule calculates the amount of subsidy for Industrial and Wholesale customer classes proposed to be phased in as part of this Cause. Allocated cost of service is adjusted to reflect across-the-board increase and only 50% of the remaining increase over and above the across-the-board rate increase.

#### Calculation of Adjusted Cost of Service - Page 49

This schedule calculates the adjusted cost of service where the subsidy for Industrial and Wholesale customer classes are allocated pro-rata to the Residential and Government customer classes.

#### Comparison of Adjusted Cost of Service with Revenue under Proposed Rates - Page 50

This schedule compares the revenues, by user class, generated by existing rates and proposed rates with the phased-in cost of service.

#### Estimated Annual Operating Revenue at Proposed Rates and Charges - Page 51

This page details the calculations used to determine the projected revenues at proposed rates.

## Comparison of Present and Proposed Monthly Bills at Selected Usage Amounts Based upon Adjusted Cost of Service – Page 52

The proposed rates are compared with existing rates for various water usage amounts, meter sizes, and wholesale users on this schedule.

#### Summary of Present and Proposed Water Rates and Charges – Pages 53 – 54

The proposed phased-in cost of service rates and charges, calculated on the preceding schedules are summarized on this page next to the present rates and charges.

ESTIMATED INFORMATION

### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES

See explanation of adjustments on pages 8 - 15.

	12 Months Ended 12/31/23	Adjustments	Ref.	Estimated
Treatment:	12500.000			
Salaries and wages	\$303,233	\$12,676	(2)	\$315,909
Purchased power	523,798	(590)	(1)	523,208
Chemicals	281,412			281,412
Materials and supplies	19,830	06-77-678-07	estan.	19,830
Contractual services	83,854	87,790	(3)	171,644
Total Treatment	1,212,127	99,876		1,312,003
Transmission and Distribution:				
Salaries and wages	474,943	111,270	(2)	586,213
Purchased power	44,135	590	(1)	44,725
Materials and supplies	189,499	(2,992)	(3)	186,507
Contractual services	455,996	(35,838)	(3)	420,158
Transportation	48,209	***************************************		48,209
Total Transmission and Distribution	1,212,782	73,030		1,285,812
Customer Accounts:				
Salaries and wages	192,678	9,429	(2)	202,107
Contractual services	7,471			7,471
Transportation	28,704			28,704
Total Customer Accounts	228,853	9,429		238,282
Administrative and General:				
Salaries and wages	164,119	12,177	(2)	176,296
Employee pensions and benefits	565,230	77,281	(4)	642,511
Purchased power	4,477			4,477
Materials and supplies	15,931			15,931
Contractual services	358,252	(8,164)	(6)(7)	350,088
Transportation	6,657	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		6,657
Insurance	94,881	17,028	(5)	111,909
Other	11,169			11,169
Total Administrative and General	1,220,716	98,322		1,319,038
Total Operating Expenses	\$3,874,478	\$280,657		\$4,155,135

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

## ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES (Explanation of Adjustments)

#### Adjustment 1 - Purchased Power

To adjust test year expense to normalize for 12 monthly bills.

Estimated treatment	\$523,208		
Less test year expense	(523,798)		
Sub-total		(	(\$590)
Estimated transmission and distribution	44,725		
Less test year expense	(44,135)		
Sub-total			590
Estimated administrative and general	4,477		
Less test year expense	(4,477)		
Sub-total			is .
Adjustment		\$	â

(Continued on next page)

#### STUCKER FORK CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

(Cont'd)

### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES (Explanation of Adjustments)

#### Adjustment 2 - Salaries and Wages

To adjust test year expense to reflect estimated salaries and wages and additional 3 employees, per utility management.

Estimated treatment	\$315,909	
Less test year expense	(303,233)	
Sub-total		\$12,676
Estimated transmission and distribution	586,213	
Less test year expense	(474,943)	
Sub-total		111,270
Estimated customer accounts	202,107	
Less test year expense	(192,678)	
Sub-total		9,429
Estimated administrative and general	176,296	
Less test year expense	(164,119)	
Sub-total		12,177
Adjustment		\$145,552

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

## ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES (Explanation of Adjustments)

#### Adjustment 3 - Periodic Maintenance

To adjust test year to allow for periodic maintenance on the wells, pumps, intake valves, filter media, lagoon cleaning and tank maintenance, per consulting engineer and utility management.

I.	Intake Struc	ture Cleaning and Pump Maintenance Cleaning	
		(\$20,000 every 5 years)	\$4,000
	1000	William and processing and processing	
	b.	Intake pump maintenance	6,000
		(\$2,000 each per year, for 3 pumps)	0,000
II.	Well Mainte	enance	
47/7/11	a.	Wells and pumps - chemical cleaning	
		(\$1,900 each per year, for 5 wells)	9,500
	b.	Wells and pumps - pump maintenance	
		(\$2,500 each per year, for 5 wells)	12,500
III.		Maintenance	
	a.	High service pump maintenance	12 000
		(\$1,500 each per year, for 8 pumps)	12,000
	b.	Low service pump maintenance	
		(\$600 each per year, for 3 pumps)	1,800
	c.	Backwash pump maintenance	
		(\$1,000 each per year, for 2 pumps)	2,000
	d.	Pump control valve maintenance	
		(\$600 each per year, for 4 valves)	2,400
	e.	Plant production meter calibration	
	55 5	(\$600 each per year, for 7 meters)	4,200
		The second secon	
	f.	Turbidity meter maintenance	
		(\$600 each per year, for 9 meters)	5,400
		Sub-total forward	\$59,800

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES (Explanation of Adjustments)

#### Adjustment 3 - Periodic Maintenance (cont'd)

#### III. Austin WTP Maintenance (cont'd)

	Sub-total ca	arried forward	\$59,800
	g.	Generator maintenance	
		(\$1,900 per year, for 1 generator)	1,900
	h.	Fire extinguisher maintenance	400
	i.	Filter maintenance	
		(\$8,500 per year, for 8 filters)	68,000
	j.	Lagoon cleaning	
		(\$7,600 every 5 years)	1,520
	k.	U.V. system maintenance/bulb replacement	
		(3 reactors w/ 4 bulbs each, \$600 annually per bulb)	7,200
IV. Marble Hill WTP Maintenance			
	a.	High service pump maintenance	
		(\$1,500 each per year, for 3 pumps)	4,500
	b.	Backwash pump maintenance	
		(\$1,000 each per year, for 1 pump)	1,000
	c.	Pump control valve maintenance	
		(\$600 each per year, for 3 valves)	1,800
	d.	Plant production meter calibration	
		(\$600 each per year, for 4 meters)	2,400
	e.	Fire extinguisher maintenance	400
	f.	Filter media maintenance	
		(\$2,400 per year, for 4 filters)	9,600
		Sub-total forward	\$158,520

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES (Explanation of Adjustments)

(Explanation of regustments)

#### Adjustment 3 - Periodic Maintenance (cont'd)

	Sub-total c	arried fo	orward	\$158,520
V.	7. Tank Maintenance			
	a.		ing and inspection	7,600
	b. Tank painting			
		1.	Austin tank (500,000 gallons)	
			(\$400,000 every fifteen years)	26,700
		2.	Little York tank (100,000 gallons)	
			(\$260,000 every fifteen years)	17,300
		3.	Blocher tank (150,000 gallons)	
			(\$300,000 every fifteen years)	20,000
		4.	Commiskey tank (100,000 gallons)	
			(\$260,000 every fifteen years)	17,300
		5.	Polk Road tank (100,000 gallons)	
			(\$260,000 every fifteen years)	17,300
		6.	Double or Nothing Road tank (500,000 gallons)	
			(\$400,000 every fifteen years)	26,700
		7.	Radiotower Road (500,000 gallons)	
			(\$400,000 every fifteen years)	26,700
		8.	Lovett tank (100,000 gallons)	
			(\$260,000 every fifteen years)	17,300
		9.	Paynesville Road tank (500,000 gallons)	
			(\$400,000 every fifteen years)	26,700
		10.	Fairview Road tank (250,000 gallons)	
			(\$379,000 every fifteen years)	25,300
		11.	Austin tank 2 (1,000,000 gallons)	
			(\$500,000 every fifteen years)	33,300
		12.	Marble Hill ground tank (500,000 gallons)	
		0.00-41900	(\$250,000 every fifteen years)	16,700
		13.	1 MG Ground Storage Tank	57700-00#P1-0577-002-457
			(\$15,000 every fifteen years)	1,000
		14.	Marble Hill WTP aeration tank	
		800000	(\$170,000 every fifteen years)	11,300
		15.	Marble Hill WTP aeration tank	9,000,000
			(\$170,000 every fifteen years)	11,300
		Sub-te	otal forward	\$461,020
				-

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES (Explanation of Adjustments)

#### Adjustment 3 - Periodic Maintenance (cont'd)

	Sub-total car	rried forward	\$461,020
VI.	VI. Booster Station Maintenance and Pump Replacement		
	a.	Booster station No. 4 maintenance	3,800
	b.	Booster station No. 7 maintenance	1,900
	c.	Booster station No. 8 maintenance	1,900
VII	Meter/Contr	ol Valve Pit Maintenance	
	a.	Tank 2 control valve pit maintenance	1,500
	b.	Tank 3 control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	c.	Tank 4 control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	d.	Tank 7 control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	e.	Tank 8 control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	f.	Sommerville control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	g.	Marysville control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	h.	Rural membership control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	i.	Scottsburg control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	j.	Crothersville control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500
	k.	Pepsi control valve/metering pit maintenance	1,500_
		Sub-total	485,120
		Less test year expense	(436,160)
		Adjustment	\$48,960

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

\$77,281

### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES (Explanation of Adjustments)

#### Adjustment 4 - Employee Benefits

To adjust test	vear FICA	expense to reflect estimated payroll expens	e
TO HOLDE FORE	I come a very	citizense to remember to the property of the p	

Adjustment

Estimated payroll	\$1,280,525
Times FICA rate	7.65%
Sub-total	97,960
Less test year expense	(86,713)
Sub-total	\$11,247
To adjust test year PERF expense to reflect estimated payroll e	xpense and the 2024 PERF rate
Estimated payroll (eligible for PERF)	1,222,814
Times PERF rate	11.20%
Sub-total	136,955
Less test year expense	(119,483)
Sub-total	17,472
To adjust the test year to reflect estimated health insurance	
Estimated annual health insurance expense	418,672
Less test year expense	(370,110)
Sub-total Sub-total	48,562

#### Adjustment 5 - Vehicle, Property, Dam, General Liability, Workmans Comp Insurance

To adjust the test year to reflect estimated vehicle, property, general liability, workmans comp insurance

Estimated annual vehicle, property, dam, general liability, workmans comp expense	\$102,229
Less test year expense	(85,201)
Adjustment	\$17.028
Adjustment	4.1.1.

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES (Explanation of Adjustments)

#### Adjustment 6 - State Board of Accounts Audit

To provide an allowance for annual audit costs

Cost of 2021-2022 examination	\$27,000
Divided by 2 years	2
Sub-total	13,500
Less test year expense	(27,000)
Adjustment	(\$13,500)

#### Adjustment 7 - Accounting Contractual Services

To adjust test year expense to include annual accounting contractual services, per utility management.

Pro forma monthly accounting contractual services Times 12 months	\$9,950 12
Sub-total Less test year expense	119,400 (114,064)
Adjustment	\$5,336

## CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (Per Consulting Engineers)

Work Trucks (6 @ \$45,000 each)	\$270,000
Marble Hill WTP Electrical Improvments (Switch Gear and Generator)	460,000
Booster Station (3) Switch Gear Including One Portable Generator	380,000
Marble Hill WTP Building Expansion (3,600 sq. ft.) and WTP Expansion to 8 MGD	5,250,000
New Marble Hill Supply Wells (2 EA. @ \$500,000 Per well)	1,000,000
Austin WTP Raw Water Intake Structure Improvements (Mechanical Screen Installation)	570,000
16" Main Replacement Double or Nothing Road and Slab Road (33,820 L.F.)	4,875,000
Sub-total Less proposed financing	12,805,000 (6,250,000)
Total Capital Improvements Funded Through Utility Revenues	\$6,555,000

## SCHEDULE OF ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS AND FUNDING (Per Consulting Engineers)

#### ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS

Estimated Construction and Engineering Costs:	
Marble Hill WTP Building Expansion (3,600 sq. ft.) and	
WTP Expansion to 8 MGD	\$5,250,000
New Marble Hill Supply Wells (2 EA. @ \$500,000 Per well)	1,000,000
Sub-totals	6,250,000
Construction Contingencies	550,000
Total Estimated Construction and Engineering Costs	6,800,000
Estimated Non-Construction Costs:	
IURC Rate Case Expenses	325,000 *
Legal, Bond Counsel, Financial Advisory and General Project Contingencies	200,000
Total Estimated Non-Construction Costs	525,000
Total Estimated Project Costs	\$7,325,000
ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	
Proposed Bonds	\$7,325,000

<sup>\*</sup> Cause No. 44164 actual rate case expenses were \$467,768.64. Cause No. 44687 actual rate case expenses were \$367,481.70. Cause No. 44987 actual rate case expenses were \$317,060.47.

#### SCHEDULE OF AMORTIZATION OF \$7,325,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF PORPOSED WATERWORKS REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2025

Principal payable annually, January 1st, beginning January 1, 2028.

Interest payable semi-annually, January 1st and July 1st, beginning January 1, 2026.

Assumed interest rate as indicated.

Assumes bonds dated September 1, 2025.

Payment	Principal	Assumed Interest		Debt Service		Bond Year
Date	Balance	Rate	Principal	Interest	Total	Total
	(In \$1,000's)	(%)	(In \$1,000's)	(	In Dollars	)
01/01/26	\$7,325			\$97,666.67	\$97,666.67	\$97,666.6
07/01/26	7,325			146,500.00	146,500.00	
01/01/27	7,325			146,500.00	146,500.00	293,000.0
07/01/27	7,325			146,500.00	146,500.00	
01/01/28	7,325	4.00	\$1	146,500.00	147,500.00	294,000.0
07/01/28	7,324			146,480.00	146,480.00	
01/01/29	7,324	4.00	1	146,480.00	147,480.00	293,960.0
07/01/29	7,323			146,460.00	146,460.00	
01/01/30	7,323	4.00	1	146,460.00	147,460.00	293,920.0
07/01/30	7,322			146,440.00	146,440.00	
01/01/31	7,322	4.00	1	146,440.00	147,440.00	293,880.0
07/01/31	7,321			146,420.00	146,420.00	
01/01/32	7,321	4.00	1	146,420.00	147,420.00	293,840.0
07/01/32	7,320			146,400.00	146,400.00	
01/01/33	7,320	4.00	1	146,400.00	147,400.00	293,800.0
07/01/33	7,319			146,380.00	146,380.00	
01/01/34	7,319	4.00	1	146,380.00	147,380.00	293,760.0
07/01/34	7,318			146,360.00	146,360.00	
01/01/35	7,318	4.00	1	146,360.00	147,360.00	293,720.0
07/01/35	7,317	902-2036		146,340.00	146,340.00	
01/01/36	7,317	4.00	1	146,340.00	147,340.00	293,680.0
07/01/36	7,316	7.54.4.30		146,320.00	146,320.00	
01/01/37	7,316	4.00	1	146,320.00	147,320.00	293,640.0
07/01/37	7,315	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		146,300.00	146,300.00	
01/01/38	7,315	4.00	1	146,300.00	147,300.00	293,600.0
07/01/38	7,314			146,280.00	146,280.00	
01/01/39	7,314	4.00	692	146,280.00	838,280.00	984,560.0
07/01/39	6,622			132,440.00	132,440.00	
01/01/40	6,622	4.00	719	132,440.00	851,440.00	983,880.0
07/01/40	5,903			118,060.00	118,060,00	
01/01/41	5,903	4.00	747	118,060.00	865,060.00	983,120.0
07/01/41	5,156			103,120.00	103,120.00	
01/01/42	5,156	4.00	777	103,120.00	880,120.00	983,240.0
07/01/42	4,379			87,580.00	87,580.00	
01/01/43	4,379	4.00	808	87,580.00	895,580.00	983,160.0
07/01/43	3,571			71,420.00	71,420.00	
01/01/44	3,571	4.00	841	71,420.00	912,420.00	983,840.0
07/01/44	2,730			54,600.00	54,600.00	
01/01/45	2,730	4.00	875	54,600.00	929,600.00	984,200.0
07/01/45	1,855	Nesson?:		37,100.00	37,100.00	
01/01/46	1,855	4.00	909	37,100.00	946,100.00	983,200.0
07/01/46	946	CONTEST		18,920.00	18,920.00	00000000000000000000000000000000000000
01/01/47	946	4.00	946	18,920.00	964,920.00	983,840.0
	Totals		\$7,325	\$5,150,506.67	\$12,475,506.67	\$12,475,506.6

Average annual debt service for the five bond years ending January 1, 2031

\$293,752.00

#### SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED COMBINED BOND AMORTIZATION

			Outstanding					
	2014			2020				89 16
Payment	Refunding	2014	2017	Refunding	2020	Proposed		Bond
Date	Bonds	Bonds	Bonds	Bonds	Bonds	2025 Bonds	Combined	Year
01/01/24	\$282,525.00	\$77,212.50	\$155,018.75	\$294,275.00	\$86,133.25		\$895,164.50	\$895,164.50
07/01/24	8,475.00	77,212.50	38,725,00	60,825.00	65,568.25		250,805.75	
01/01/25	288,475.00	77,212.50	158,725.00	295.825.00	86,568.25		906,805.75	1,157,611.50
07/01/25	4,275.00	77,212.50	37,225.00	57,300.00	64,975.00		240,987.50	
01/01/26	289,275.00	77,212.50	157,225.00	302,300.00	86,975.00	\$97,666.67	1,010,654.17	1,251,641.67
07/01/26	207,21.5100	77,212.50	35,725.00	53,625.00	64,353.50	146,500.00	377,416.00	
01/01/27		347,212.50	185,725.00	303,625.00	87,353.50	146,500.00	1,070,416.00	1,447,832.00
07/01/27		72,825.00	33,662.50	49,875.00	63,703.75	146,500.00	366,566.25	
01/01/28		352,825.00	188,662.50	309,875.00	88,703.75	147,500.00	1,087,566.25	1,454,132.50
07/01/28		68,275.00	31,531.25	45,975.00	62,997.50	146,480.00	355,258.75	
01/01/29		358,275.00	186,531.25	315,975.00	88,997.50	147,480.00	1,097,258.75	1,452,517.50
07/01/29		63,200.00	29,206.25	41,925.00	62,263.00	146,460.00	343,054.25	41 #1.00 contracts (1.00 contracts)
01/01/30		358,200.00	194,206.25	316,925.00	90,263.00	147,460.00	1,107,054.25	1,450,108.50
07/01/30		57,300.00	26,731.25	37,800.00	61,472.00	146,440.00	329,743.25	
01/01/31		367,300.00	191,731.25	322,800.00	90,472.00	147,440.00	1,119,743.25	1,449,486.50
07/01/31		51,100.00	24,050.00	33,525.00	60,652.75	146,420.00	315,747.75	
01/01/32		376,100.00	199,050.00	323,525.00	91,652.75	147,420.00	1,137,747.75	1,453,495.50
07/01/32		44,600.00	21,206.25	29,175.00	59,777.00	146,400.00	301,158.25	
01/01/33		384,600.00	196,206.25	329,175.00	92,777.00	147,400.00	1,150,158.25	1,451,316.50
07/01/33		37,800.00	18,143.75	24,675.00	58,844.75	146,380.00	285,843.50	
01/01/34		382,800.00	203,143.75	334,675.00	92,844.75	147,380.00	1,160,843.50	1,446,687.00
07/01/34		30,900.00	14,906.25	20,025.00	57,884.25	146,360.00	270,075.50	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
01/01/35		390,900.00	204,906.25	340,025.00	93,884.25	147,360.00	1,177,075.50	1,447,151.00
07/01/35		23,700.00	11,343.75	15,225.00	56,867.25	146,340.00	253,476.00	118 (1 C.18CCC), T.5.(C.)
01/01/36		403,700.00	206,343.75	345,225.00	95,867.25	147,340.00	1,198,476.00	1,451,952.00
07/01/36		16,100.00	7,687.50	10,275.00	55,765.50	146,320.00	236,148.00	
01/01/37		411,100.00	212,687.50	345,275.00	96,765.50	147,320.00	1,213,148.00	1,449,296.00
07/01/37		8,200.00	3,843.75	5,250.00	54,607.25	146,300.00	218,201.00	
01/01/38		418,200.00	208,843.75	355,250.00	97,607.25	147,300.00	1,227,201.00	1,445,402.00
07/01/38				DATE # 00 DIA DE 100	53,392.50	146,280.00	199,672.50	
01/01/39					98,392.50	838,280.00	936,672.50	1,136,345.00
07/01/39					52,121.25	132,440.00	184,561.25	
01/01/40					100,121.25	851,440.00	951,561.25	1,136,122.50
07/01/40					50,765.25	118,060.00	168,825.25	
01/01/41					101,765.25	865,060.00	966,825.25	1,135,650.50
07/01/41					49,324.50	103,120.00	152,444.50	
01/01/42					103,324.50	880,120.00	983,444.50	1,135,889.00
07/01/42					47,799.00	87,580.00	135,379.00	
01/01/43					104,799.00	895,580.00	1,000,379.00	1,135,758.00
07/01/43					46,188.75	71,420.00	117,608.75	
01/01/44					106,188.75	912,420.00	1,018,608.75	1,136,217.50
07/01/44					44,493.75	54,600.00	99,093.75	1769-1905 1-51 (1966)
01/01/45			·		107.493.75	929,600.00	1,037,093.75	1,136,187.50
btotals	\$873,025.00	\$5,488,487,50	\$3,182,993,75	\$5,320,225.00	\$3,282,766,75	\$10,508,466.67	\$28,655,964.67	\$28,655,964.67
rototara	3013,023,00	W27007101	<b>カン・1 リル・アフン・1 ン</b>	THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF A SECOND	March Street Company of the Company	and the state of the state of the	The state of the s	

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

#### SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED COMBINED BOND AMORTIZATION

		Outstanding						
Payment Date	2014 Refunding Bonds	2014 Bonds	2017 Bonds	2020 Refunding Bonds	2020 Bonds	Proposed 2025 Bonds	Combined	Bond Year
Date	Bonds	Donus	Donus	Donus	Doug	LULU DUNGS	Combined	- Teat
Subtotals carried								
forward	\$873,025.00	\$5,488,487.50	\$3,182,993.75	\$5,320,225.00	\$3,282,766.75	\$10,508,466.67	\$28,655,964.67	\$28,655,964.67
07/01/45					42,714.00	37,100.00	79,814.00	
01/01/46					109,714.00	946,100.00	1,055,814.00	1,135,628.00
07/01/46					40,821.25	18,920.00	59,741.25	
01/01/47					110,821.25	964,920.00	1,075,741.25	1,135,482.50
07/01/47					38,843.75		38,843.75	
01/01/48					112,843.75		112,843.75	151,687.50
07/01/48					36,753.25		36,753.25	
01/01/49					115,753.25		115,753.25	152,506.50
07/01/49					34,521.50		34,521.50	
01/01/50					117,521.50		117,521.50	152,043.00
07/01/50					32,176.75		32,176.75	
01/01/51					120,176.75		120,176.75	152,353.50
07/01/51					29,690.75		29,690.75	
01/01/52					122,690.75		122,690.75	152,381.50
07/01/52					27,063.50		27,063.50	
01/01/53					125,063.50		125,063.50	152,127.00
07/01/53					24,295.00		24,295.00	
01/01/54					128,295.00		128,295.00	152,590.00
07/01/54					21,357.00		21,357.00	0.000-Me104.00.000
01/01/55					130,357.00		130,357.00	151,714.00
07/01/55					18,277.75		18,277.75	2
01/01/56					134,277.75		134,277.75	152,555.50
07/01/56					15,000.75		15,000.75	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
01/01/57					137,000.75		137,000.75	152,001.50
07/01/57					11,554.25		11,554.25	
01/01/58					140,554.25		140,554.25	152,108.50
07/01/58					7,910.00		7,910.00	372
01/01/59					143,910.00		143,910.00	151,820.00
07/01/59					4,068.00		4,068.00	-cvaves evanted Att
01/01/60					148,068.00		148,068.00	152,136.00
Totals	\$873,025.00	\$5,488,487.50	\$3,182,993.75	\$5,320,225.00	\$5,564,861.75	\$12,475,506.67	\$32,905,099.67	\$32,905,099.67

Average annual debt service for the five bond years ending January 1, 2031

\$1,450,815.40

## ESTIMATED ANNUAL REVENUE REQUIREMENTS AND ANNUAL REVENUES

See Explanation of References, page 22.

	12 Months Ended			
Revenue Requirements:	12/31/23	Adjustments	Ref.	Estimated
Operation and maintenance	\$3,874,478	\$280,657	(1)	\$4,155,135
Debt service:				
Outstanding bonds	1,154,866	2,197	(2)	1,157,063
Proposed bonds	±	293,752	(3)	293,752
Debt service reserve:				
Outstanding bonds	15,211	ā	(4)	15,211
Proposed bonds	5	58,750	(5)	58,750
Replacements and improvements	408,929	581,101	(6)	990,030
Sub-totals	5,453,484	1,216,457		6,669,941
Less interest income	(54,582)	28,952	(7)	(25,630)
Less penalties	(19,271)	2	(8)	(19,271)
Less other income	(65,337)	18,098	(9)	(47,239)
Total Net Revenue Requirements	\$5,314,294	\$1,263,507		\$6,577,801
Annual Revenues:				
Metered water revenue	\$2,913,129		(8)	\$2,913,129
Morgan Foods water revenue	1,001,830	æ	(8)	1,001,830
Wholesale water revenue	988,824	(105,069)	(10)	883,755
Fire protection	204,160		(8)	204,160
Total Annual Present Rate Revenues	\$5,107,943	(105,069)		\$5,002,874
Additional Revenues Required				\$1,574,927
Overall Increase in Revenues Required (If Across-The-Board)				31.5%

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

# ESTIMATED ANNUAL REVENUE REQUIREMENTS AND ANNUAL REVENUES (Explanation of References)

(1)	To reflect estimated operation and maintenance expenses, see pages 7 to 15.	
	Adjustment	\$280,657
(2)	To reflect the average annual debt service on the outstanding bonds.	
	Average annual principal and interest payment (see page 64) Less test year amount	\$1,157,063 (1,154,866)
	Adjustment	\$2,197
(3)	To reflect the average annual debt service on the Proposed 2025 Bonds.	
	Adjustment (see page 18)	\$293,752
(4)	To provide an allowance for funding the debt service reserve over a ten-year period.	
	Debt service reserve requirement for 2020 Bonds Divided by 10 year funding period	\$152,112 10
	Adjustment	\$15,211
(5)	To provide an allowance for funding the debt service reserve on the Proposed 2025 Bonds over a five-year	r period.
	Incremental debt service reserve requirement for Proposed 2025 Bonds Divided by 5 year funding period	\$293,752 5
	Adjustment	\$58,750
(6)	To provide an allowance for replacements and improvements equal to the annual depreciation allowance.	
	Utility plant in service as of 12/31/2023 Less land and land rights	\$50,086,638 (585,142)
	Depreciable capital assets Times composite depreciation rate	49,501,496 2.0%
	Annual depreciation allowance Less test year amount	990,030 (408,929)
	Adjustment	\$581,101
(7)	To remove non-cash activity recorded for the amortization of original issue bond premiums on the outstar	nding bonds.
	2014 Refunding Bonds premium annual amortization 2014 Bonds premium annual amortization 2017 Bonds premium annual amortization 2020 Refunding Bonds premium annual amortization Adjustment	\$1,549 6,372 194 20,837 \$28,952
(8)	Based on test year amounts.	
(9)	To remove capital credits from Clark County REMC and Jackson County REMC recorded to Miscellaneous Service Revenue.	
	Adjustment	\$18,098
(10)	To remove Washington Township settlement payment of \$105,069.12 for not meeting the minimum volume requirement from May 2018 to December 2019.	\$105,069

COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

#### CONSUMER ANALYSIS OF TEST YEAR

(12 Months Ended 12/31/2023)

					Usage Billings (Water)				
		Number of Bills	Times Rate	Service Revenue	First 10,000 Gal. Block Usage	Next 240,000 Gal. Block Usage	Next 250,000 Gal. Block Usage	Over 500,000 Ga Block Usage	
Residential									
5/8	inch meter	92,075	\$7.85	\$722,789	321,034,432	63,664,998	911,120	190	
3/4	inch meter	7	8.30	58	10,120	18	553	20	
1	inch meter	981	9.45	9,270	4,686,790	3,559,300	25	85	
2	inch meter	102_	15.35	1,566	793,310	4,255,660	-	- E	
Subtotals		93,165		\$733,683	326,524,652	71,479,958	911,120	( <del>-</del> -1)	
Times Rate					\$4.44	\$3,56	\$3.33	\$2.54	
Totals					\$1,449,769	\$254,469	\$3,034	\$ -	
Total Resid	ential Revenues							\$2,440,955	
Commercia	al:								
5/8	inch meter	1,643	\$7.85	12,898	4,109,820	6,234,300	387,480	-	
1	inch meter	190	9.45	1,796	863,850	2,142,220			
1 1/2	inch meter	52	11.00	572	252,950	1,723,540	50	•	
2	inch meter	66	15.35	1,013	473,450	3,234,310	166,710	(4)	
3	inch meter	28	47.20	1,322	176,900	2,880,000	1,810,200	482,300	
Subtotals		1,979		\$17,601	5,876,970	16,214,370	2,364,390	482,300	
Times Rate					\$4.44	\$3.56	\$3.33	\$2.54	
Totals					\$26,094	\$57,723	\$7,873	\$1,225	
Total Comp	nercial Revenue	s						\$110,516	

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

#### CONSUMER ANALYSIS OF TEST YEAR (12 Months Ended 12/31/2023)

						Usage Billings (Water)			
		Number of	Times	Service	First 10,000 Gal.	Next 240,000 Gal.	Next 250,000 Gal.	Over 500,000 Gal.	
100 10 10.12 44		Bills	Rate	Revenue	Block Usage	Block Usage	Block Usage	Block Usage	
Industrial:	ingorougitus regiones as	10	07.05	277	212.000	20 200			
5/8	inch meter	48	\$7.85	377 227	212,080	38,200 258,080	:	-	
1	inch meter	24	9.45 15.35	184	135,910 1,690	238,080			
2	inch meter inch meter	12 12	47.20	566	120,000	1,646,400			
6	inch meter	26_	86.40	2,246	240,000	5,760,000	6,000,000	511,265,000	
Subtotals		122		\$3,600	709,680	7,702,680	6,000,000	511,265,000	
Times Rate	,				\$4.44	\$3.56	\$3,33	\$2.54	
Totals					\$3,151	\$27,422	\$19,980	\$1,298,613	
Total Industr	rial Revenues							\$1,352,766	
Governmen	t:								
5/8	inch meter	338	\$7.85	2,653	575,110	102,360	=		
1	inch meter	12	9.45	113	120,000	950,600			
2	inch meter	74	15.35	1,136	587,990	3,498,860	922,200	6,030,410	
3	inch meter	12	47.20	566	114,800	461,800	~	300	
4	inch meter	14	58.95	825	120,000	1,474,780	514.000	2 100 000	
6	inch meter	12_	86.40	1,037	100,000	1,761,000	514,000	2,188,000	
Subtotals		462		\$6,330	1,617,900	8,249,400	1,436,200	8,218,410	
Times Rate					\$4.44	\$3,56	\$3,33	\$2,54	
Totals					\$7,183	\$29,368	\$4,783	\$20,875	
Total Govern	nment Revenues							\$68,539	
Wholesale	PACCA CONTROL	19947			600.000	14 400 000	15 000 000	217 125 502	
6	inch meter	60			600,000	14,400,000	15,000,000	317,135,582	
Times Rate					\$2.54	\$2.54	\$2.54	\$2.54	
Totals					\$1,524	\$36,576	\$38,100	\$805,524	
Total Whole	sale Revenues							\$881,724	
Total Bills								95,788	
Total Usage	Gal.							1,316,188,612	
Total Calcul	ated Revenues							\$4,854,500	

#### CONSUMER ANALYSIS SUMMARY (12 Months Ended 12/31/2023)

Consumer Class	Number of Bills	Gallons Sold	Calculated Revenues	
Residential	93,165	398,915,730	\$2,440,955	
Commercial	1,979	24,938,030	110,516	
Industrial	122	525,677,360	1,352,766	
Government	462	19,521,910	68,539	
Wholesale	60	347,135,582	881,724	
Total	95,788	1,316,188,612	\$4,854,500	
Control			\$4,798,714	
Variance			1.16% *	

<sup>\*</sup> Variance is partially due to an issue with meter reading in January and February, 2023. Customers were billed based on an average usage until the meters were fixed and/or replaced.

## FIRE PROTECTION CONSUMER ANALYSIS SUMMARY (12 Months Ended 12/31/2023)

#### **Public Fire Protection**

Public Fire Protecti	1011		X
		Number of	Annual Fire Protection
Meter Size	Monthly charge	Bills	Revenues
5/8"	\$8.74	15,973	\$139,604
3/4"	13.14	#	
1"	21.88	121	2,647
1 1/2"	43.75	12	525
2"	70.00	108	7,560
3"	131.25	36	4,725
4"	218.74	12	2,625
6"	437.47	12	5,250
Totals		16,274	\$162,936
Private Fire Protec	tion		W 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	Annual Charge	Hydrants Number	Hydrant Rental Revenues
	\$1,061.56	20	\$21,231
Automatic sprinkler			
		No. of	Sprinkler
Meter size	Annual Charge	Connections	Revenues
6 inch meter	\$1,061.56	2	\$2,123
8 inch meter	1,887.23	1	1,887
10 inch meter	2,948.81	1	2,949
12 inch meter	4,246.27	2	8,493
Totals		6	\$15,452
Total Private Fire Pr	otection Revenues		\$36,683
Total Fire Protection	Revenues		\$199,619
Control			\$204,160
Variance			-2.22%

#### CALCULATION OF TEST YEAR EQUIVALENT METERS

(12 Months Ended 12/31/2023)

Customer Clas	<u>ss</u>	Annual Bills	Average Connections	5/8 Inch Factor	Equivalent Meters and Services
Residential:					
5/8	inch meter	92,075	7,673	1.0	7,673
3/4	inch meter	7	1	1.5	2
1	inch meter	981	82	2.5	205
2	inch meter	102	9	0.8	72_
Sub-tot	als	93,165	7,765		7,952
Commercial:					
5/8	inch meter	1,643	137	1.0	137
1	inch meter	190	16	2.5	40
1 1/2	inch meter	52	4	5.0	20
2	inch meter	66	6	8.0	48
3	inch meter	28	2	15.0	30
Sub-tot	als	1,979	165_		275
Industrial:					
5/8	inch meter	48	4	1.0	4
1	inch meter	24	2	2.5	5
2	inch meter	12	I	8.0	8
3	inch meter	12	1	15.0	15
6	inch meter	26	2	50.0	100
Sub-tot	als	122	10		132_
Government:					
5/8	inch meter	338	28	1.0	28
1	inch meter	12	1	2.5	3
2	inch meter	74	6	8.0	48
3	inch meter	12	1	15.0	15
4	inch meter	14	1	25.0	25
6	inch meter	12	1	50.0	50
Sub-tot	als	462	38_		169_
Wholesale:					
Town of Croth		12	1	50.0	50
	rship Water Corp.	24	2	50.0	100
	wp. Water Corp.	12	1	50.0	50
Marysville-Ot	isco-Nabb Water Corp.	12	- <u>I</u>	50.0	50
Sub-tot	als	60_	5		250
Tot	als	95,788	7,983		8,778

## CALCULATION OF EQUIVALENT FIRE HYDRANT CONNECTIONS (12 Months Ended 12/31/2023)

	Number*	Equivalency Ratio**	Equivalent Fire Connections
	Tvullioci		Connections
Public fire hydrants	167	1.0	167
Private fire hydrants	20	1.0	20
Sub-totals	187		187
Automatic Sprinkler Connection:			
6 inch meter	2	1.0000	2
8 inch meter	1	1.7778	2
10 inch meter	1	2.7778	3
12 inch meter	2	4.0000	8
Totals	193		202

<sup>\*</sup> Per utility management.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Reflects the sum of the squares methodology.

#### TEST YEAR UNITS OF SERVICE

Base-Extra Capacity Method (12 Months Ended 12/31/2023) (Per consulting engineer)

	Base		Maximum Day			Maximum Hou	r	Customer		
	Test Year Annual Sales	Average Day	Capacity Factor (3)	Total Capacity	Extra Capacity (4)	Capacity Factor (3)	Total Capacity	Extra Capacity (5)	Equivalent Connections	Bills
Retail Service:	(1)	(2)	%		(2)	%	(2)	(2)		
Residential	398,915.7	1,093	215	2,350	1,257	350	3,826	1,476	7,952	93,165
Commercial	24,938.0	68	195	133	65	325	221	88	275	1,979
Industrial	525,677.4	1,440	170	2,448	1,008	225	3,240	792	132	122
Government (6)	11,283.7	31	195	60	29	325	101	41	169	462
Wholesale	347,135.6	951	155	1,474	523	230	2,187_	713	250	60_
Totals	1,307,950.4	3,583		6,465	2,882		9,575	3,110	8,778	95,788

#### Reference Explanations

- (1) 1,000's of gallons
- (2) 1,000's of gallons per day
- (3) Calculated based on test year usage data
- (4) Capacity in excess of average day usage
- (5) Capacity in excess of maximum day usage
- (6) Normalized test year annual sales to remove usage related to a major water leak on customer premise and non-recurring usage from City of Scottsburg who's treatment operations were down for a portion of the test year.

#### ALLOCATION OF UTILITY PLANT TO FUNCTIONAL COST COMPONENTS

Base-Extra Capacity Method (Per consulting engineer)

	Utility Plant		The state of the s	Capacity	Customer	Direct Fire		200000000000000000000000000000000000000				
	in Service	121	Maximum	Maximum	Meters and	Protection			centage Alloca		20	D 6
Control of	at 12/31/2023	Base	Day	Hour*	Services	Service	BAS	MXD	MXH	CUS	FP	Ref.
Source of Supply Plant:	E1 556 150	0000 107	0004.047				55.40	44.60				(2)
Structures and improvements	\$1,556,150	\$862,107	\$694,043				100.00	44.00				(2)
Collecting and impounding reservoirs	1,558,557	1,558,557					100.00					
Wells and springs	1,640,339	1,640,339	2007				V	10001000				(1)
Supply mains	95,819	53,084	42,735				55.40	44.60				(2)
Pumping equipment	503,893	279,157	224,736				55.40	44.60				(2)
Water Treatment:			0.502/0.2030000				9.00090	number datas.				10/4/01
Structures and improvements	15,472,731	8,571,893	6,900,838				55.40	44,60				(2)
Water treatment equipment	1,390,046	770,085	619,961				55.40	44.60				(2)
Other Plant and miscellaneous equipment	1,850	1,025	825				55.40	44,60				(2)
Transmission and Distribution:												
Structures and improvements	2,073,932	207,393		\$1,866,539			10.00		90.00			(3)
Distribution reservoirs and standpipe	2,564,043	256,404		2,307,639			10.00		90.00			(3)
Mains	13,753,606	5,146,600	4,139,835	4,467,171			37.42	30,10	32,48			(4)
Services	1,096,938				\$1,096,938					100.00		(5)
Meters and meter installations	3,458,609				3,458,609					100,00		(5)
Hydrants	148,777				Allowed Dorland	\$148,777					100.00	(6)
General Plant:	VARIATE VARIA					CAST CHARLES						36334
Land	585,142	249,796	163,021	111,587	58,807	1.931	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Structures and improvements	220,675	94,206	61,480	42,083	22,178	728	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Laboratory Equipment	12,136	5,181	3,381	2,314	1,220	40	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Power operated equipment	390,613	166,753	108,824	74,490	39,257	1,289	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Communications equipment	264,595	112,956	73,716	50,458	26,592	873	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Office familiare and equipment	128,865	55,012	35,902	24,575	12,951	425	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Transportation equipment	1,174,871	501,552	327,319	224,048	118,075	3,877	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Stores equipment	4,305	1,838	1,199	821	433	14	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Tools, shop and garage equipment	82,078	35,039	22,867	15,652	8,249	271	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Other tangible plant	1,843,934	787,176	513,720	351,638	185,315	6,085	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Miscellaneous equipment	64,134	27,379	17,868	12,230	6,445	212	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
wiscenaneous equipment	04,134	21,319	17,800	12,230	0,443	212	42,09	27.00	19.07	10,03	0,33	(0)
Sub-totals	50,086,638	21,383,532	13,952,270	9,551,245	5,035,069	164,522	42,69	27.86	19,07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Less Contributions	(10,652,351)	(4,547,489)	(2,967,745)	(2,031,403)	(1,070,561)	(35,153)	42,69	27.86	19.07	10.05	0.33	(7)
Rate Base	\$39,434,287	\$16,836,043	\$10,984,525	\$7,519,842	\$3,964,508	\$129,369	42.69	27.86	19,07	10.05	0.33	

Maximum hour demand in excess of maximum day demand.

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

## ALLOCATION OF UTILITY PLANT TO FUNCTIONAL COST COMPONENTS Explanation of Allocations

- (1) Allocated 100% to base.
- (2) Allocated in ratio to maximum day demand.

	1,000's of Gallons	%
Average day demand	3,583	55.40
Maximum day excess capacity	2,882	44.60_
Totals	6,465	100.0

- (3) Allocated 10% to base and 90% to maximum hour.
- (4) Allocated in ratio to maximum hour demand.

	1,000's of Gallons	%
Average day demand	3,583	37.42
Maximum day excess capacity	2,882	30.10
Maximum hour excess capacity	3,110	32.48
Totals	9,575	100.0

- (5) Allocated 100% to meters and services.
- (6) Allocated 100% to fire protection.
- (7) Allocated pro rata to all other allocable utility plant.

### 

Base-Extra Capacity Method

		Extra Capacity		Custome	er Costs	Direct Fire								
	Estimated	- Marine Co.	Maximum	Maximum	Meters and	Billing and	Protection		V 474 FB	Percentage		D.F.E.E.	- man	
Torrison	Expense	Base	Day	Hour*	Services	Collection	Service	BAS	MXD	MXH	MET	BILL	FP	Ref.
Treatment:	\$315,909	\$175,077	\$140,832					55.42	44,58					(2)
Salaries and wages Purchased power	523,208	289,962	233,246					55.42	44.58					(2)
Chemicals	281,412	281,412	233,240					100.00	44.20					(2)
Materials and supplies	19,830	10,990	8,840					55.42	44.58					
Contractual services	171,644	95,125	76,519					55.42	44.58					(2) (2)
Transmission and Distribution:	171,044	95,125	70,319					33,42	44,36					(2)
Salaries and wages	586,213	142,392	105,049	\$219,361	\$115,601		\$3,810	24.29	17.92	37.42	19.72		0.65	(3)
Purchased power	44,725	16,736	13,462	14,527	3113,001		33,010	37.42	30.10	32.48	19.72		0.03	(4)
Materials and supplies	186,507	45,303	33,422	69,791	36,779		1,212	24.29	17.92	37.42	19.72		0.65	
Contractual services	420,158	102,057	75,292	157,223	82,855		2,731	24.29	17.92	37.42	19.72		0.65	(3)
Transportation	48,209	11,710	8,639	18,040	9,507		313	24.29	17.92	37.42	19.72		0.65	(3)
Customer Accounts:	40,209	11,/10	0,037	10,040	9,307		313	24,29	17.92	37,42	19.72		0.03	(3)
Salaries and wages	202,107					\$202,107						100.00		153
Contractual services	7,471					7,471						100.00		(5)
Transportation	28,704					28,704						100.00		(5)
Administrative and General:	20,704					26,704						100.00		(5)
Salaries and wages	176,296	50,687	39,256	35,022	18,456	22.267	608	28.74	22.27	19.87	10.47	18.30	0.25	16
	642,511	184,724	143,069	127,638	67,264	32,267		28.74	22.27 22.27	19.87	10.47	18.30	0.35	(6)
Employee pensions and benefits	4,477	1,329	1,016	995	524	117,599 596	2,217	29.68	22.69				0.35	(7)
Purchased power	7-9-17 E-17-17	4,729					17			22.23	11.71	13.30		(8)
Materials and supplies	15,931		3,615	3,541	1,866	2,119	61	29.68	22.69	22.23	11.71	13.30	0.39	(8)
Contractual services	350,088	103,899	79,449	77,807	41,006 780	46,576 886	1,351	29.68	22,69	22,23	11.71	13.30	0.39	(8)
Transportation	6,657 111,909	1.976 47,779	1,511	1,478	3,77.75	886	26 367	29.68	22.69	22.23	11.71	13.30	0.39	(8)
Insurance Other			31,173	21,340	11,250	1 400	43	42.69	27.86	19.07	10.05	100	0.33	(9)
Other	11,169	3,315	2,535	2,482	1,308	1,486	43	29.68	22.69	22,23	11.71	13.30	0.39	(8)
Total Operating Expenses	4,155,135	1,569,202	996,925	749,245	387,196	439,811	12,756	37.77	23.99	18.03	9.32	10.58	0.31	(10)
Less Other Income	(47,239)	(17,840)	(11,334)	(8,518)	(4,402)	(5,000)	(145)	37.77	23,99	18.03	9.32	10.58	0.31	(10)
Less Penalties	(19,271)	(7,277)	(4,624)	(3,475)	(1,796)	(2,040)	(59)	37.77	23.99	18.03	9.32	10.58	0.31	(10)
Less Interest Income	(25,630)	(9,679)	(6,149)	(4,622)	(2,388)	(2,713)	(79)	37.77	23.99	18.03	9.32	10.58	0.31	(10)
Net Operating Expenses	\$4,062,995	\$1,534,406	\$974,818	\$732,630	\$378,610	\$430,058	\$12,473	37.77	23.99	18.03	9.32	10.58	0,31	

Maximum hour demand in excess of maximum day demand.

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

### ALLOCATION OF ESTIMATED CASH OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES TO FUNCTIONAL COST COMPONENTS

(Explanation of Allocations)

(1) Allocated 100% to base.

(2)	Allocated in ratio to maximum day demand.		
		1,000's of	
		Gallons	%
	Average day demand	3,583	55.42
	Maximum day excess capacity	2,882	44.58
	Totals	6,465	100.0
(3)	Allocated pro rata based on the allocation of total Trans and Distribution plant.	mission	
	<u>*</u> ;	Transmission and	
		Distribution Plant	%
	Average day demand	\$5,610,397	24.29
	Maximum day excess capacity	4,139,835	17.92
	Maximum hour excess capacity	8,641,349	37.42
	Meters and services	4,555,547	19.72
	Direct fire protection	148,777	0.65
	Totals	\$23,095,905	100.0
(4)	Allocated in ratio to maximum hour demand.		
8.0		1,000's of	
		Gallons	%
	Average day demand	3,583	37.42
	Maximum day excess capacity	2,882	30.10
	Maximum hour excess capacity	3,110	32.48
	Totals	9,575	100.0

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

## ALLOCATION OF ESTIMATED CASH OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE EXPENSES TO FUNCTIONAL COST COMPONENTS

- (5) Allocated 100% to billing and collection.
- (6) Allocated pro rata to all other functionalized payroll.
- (7) Allocated pro rata based upon total payroll.
- (8) Allocated in ratio to all other functionalized expenses exclusive of purchased power and chemicals.
- (9) Allocated pro rata based upon utility plant.
- (10) Allocated pro rata based on all other functionalized cash operating expenses.

#### UNIT COSTS OF SERVICE (12 Months Ended 12/31/2023)

	Net	Allocable To All Customers						
	Estimated		Extra Capacity		Customer Costs		Direct Fire	
	Revenue		Maximum	Maximum	Meters and	Billing and	Protection	
	Requirements	Base	Day	Hour*	Services	Collection	Service	Ref.
		(	-1,000's of Gallons	)	Equiv. Meters	Bills	Equiv. Hydrants	
Units of Service		1,307,950.4	2,882.0	3,110.0	8,778	95,788	202	(1)
Projected Cost of Service								
Net operation and maintenance expense	\$4,062,995	\$1,534,406	\$974,818	\$732,630	\$378,610	\$430,058	\$12,473	(2)
Debt service and debt service reserve	1,524,776	650,987	424,742	290,760	153,286		5,001	(3)
Replacements and improvements	990,030	422,683	275,783	188,789	99,528		3,247	(3)
Sub-totals	6,577,801	2,608,076	1,675,343	1,212,179	631,424	430,058	20,721	
Allocate estimated fire protection		5-	(118,167)	(85,498)			203,665	(4)
Net Cost of Service	\$6,577,801	\$2,608,076	\$1,557,176	\$1,126,681	\$631,424	\$430,058	\$224,386	
Total Unit Costs of Service		\$1.9940	\$540.3109	\$362.2768	\$71.9326	\$4.4897	\$1,110.8218	

<sup>\*</sup> Maximum hour demand in excess of maximum day demand.

<sup>(1)</sup> See "Test Year Units of Service", page 29.

<sup>(2)</sup> As calculated in "Allocation of Estimated Cash Operation and Maintenance Expenses to Functional Cost Components", pages 32 - 34.

<sup>(3)</sup> Allocated in ratio to plant values, page 30.

<sup>(4)</sup> Assumes 26% of inside Austin revenues from Consumer analysis work paper based upon the Maine Public Utilities Commission's methodology. Estimated fire protection is re-allocated pro rata to maximum day and maximum hour requirements.

#### COST OF SERVICE ALLOCATED TO CUSTOMER CLASSES (12 Months Ended 12/31/2023)

		Allocable To All Customers						
	Total	6	Extra Capacity		Custome	er Costs	Direct Fire	
	Costs of		Maximum	Maximum	Meters and	Billing and	Protection	
	Service	Base	Day	Hour**	Services	Collection	Service	
		(	1,000's of Gallons	)	Equiv. Meters	Bills	Equiv. Hydrants	
Unit Costs of Service*		\$1.9940	\$540.3109	\$362.2768	\$71.9326	\$4.4897	\$1,110.8218	
Allocated Costs of Service Residential:								
Units of service		398,915.7	1,257.0	1,476	7,952	93,165	E41	
Cost	\$2,999,621	\$795,438	\$679,171	\$534,721	\$572,008	\$418,283	\$	
Commercial:								
Units of service		24,938.0	65.0	88	275	1,979	127	
Cost	145,392	\$49,726	\$35,120	\$31,880	\$19,781	\$8,885	\$ -	
Industrial:								
Units of service		525,677.4	1,008.0	792	132	122	30	
Cost	1,889,800	\$1,048,201	\$544,633	\$286,923	\$9,495	\$548	\$	
Government:								
Units of service		11,283.7	29	41	169	462	(4)	
Cost	67,253	\$22,500	\$15,669	\$14,853	\$12,157	\$2,074	\$ -	
Wholesale:								
Units of service		347,135.6	523.0	713	250	60	22	
Cost	1,251,349	\$692,211	\$282,583	\$258,304	\$17,983	\$268	\$	
Fire Protection:								
Units of service		2	-			9	202	
Cost	224,386	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	<u> </u>	\$ -	\$224,386	
Total Allocated Cost of Service	\$6,577,801	\$2,608,076	\$1,557,176	\$1,126,681	\$631,424	\$430,058	\$224,386	

See page 35.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Maximum hour demand in excess of maximum day demand.

#### CALCULATION OF PROPOSED MONTHLY SERVICE CHARGES

Meter Siz	e <u>e</u>	5/8 Inch Equivalency Factor	Meter Cost Per Equiv. Unit (1)	Meter Cost Per Unit	Billing Cost Per Unit	Total	Rounded
5/8	inch meter	1.0	\$5.9944	\$5.9944	\$4.4897	\$10.4841	\$10.50
3/4	inch meter	1.5	5.9944	8.9916	4.4897	13.4813	13.50
1	inch meter	2.5	5.9944	14.9860	4.4897	19.4757	19.50
1 1/4	inch meter	4.0	5.9944	23.9775	4.4897	28.4672	28.45
1 1/2	inch meter	5.0	5.9944	29.9719	4.4897	34.4616	34.45
2	inch meter	8.0	5.9944	47.9551	4.4897	52.4448	52.45
3	inch meter	15.0	5.9944	89.9158	4.4897	94.4055	94.40
4	inch meter	25.0	5.9944	149.8596	4.4897	154.3493	154.35
6	inch meter	50.0	5.9944	299.7192	4.4897	304.2089	304.20
8	inch meter	80.0	5.9944	479.5507	4.4897	484.0404	484.05
10	inch meter	115.0	5.9944	689.3541	4.4897	693.8438	693.85

#### (1) Calculated as follows:

Annual charge per equivalent meter (page 35)	\$71.9326
Divided by 12 months	12
Monthly charge per equivalent meter	\$5.9944

#### $\frac{\text{CALCULATION OF FIRE PROTECTION CHARGES BASED UPON}}{\text{ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE}}$

#### Automatic Sprinkler Charges:

8 <u></u>	Size of Connection	Number of Private Sprinkler Connections	Equivalency Ratio*	Number of Fire Protection Equivalent Units	Adjusted Rate for 6 Inch Connection	Adjusted Rates**
1	inch connection		0.02778		\$1,110.82	\$30.86
2	inch connection		0.11111		1,110.82	123.42
3	inch connection		0.25000		1,110.82	277.71
4	inch connection		0.44444		1,110.82	493.69
6	inch connection	2	1.00000	2,0000	1,110.82	1,110.82
8	inch connection	1	1.77778	1.7778	1,110.82	1,974.79
10	inch connection	1	2.77778	2.7778	1,110.82	3,085.61
12	inch connection	2_	4.00000	8.0000	1,110.82	4,443.28
	Totals	6		14.5556		

<sup>\*</sup> Reflects the sum of the squares methodology.

#### Fire Hydrants:

Total costs to be recovered from fire protection, see page 36	\$224,386
Divide by 6" equivalent fire hydrant connections, see page 28	202
Annual charge per equivalent connection	\$1,110.82

<sup>\*\*</sup> Rate for 6" equivalent connection time equivalency ratio.

# CALCULATION OF EQUIVALENT CONNECTIONS FOR PUBLIC FIRE PROTECTION

Meter Size	Total Customers	Ratio to 5/8" Meter	Total Equivalent Connections	
5/8"	1,331	1.0	1,331	
3/4"		1.5	*	
1"	10	2.5	25	
1 1/2"	1	5.0	5	
2"	9	8.0	72	
3"	3	15.0	45	
4"	1	25.0	25	
6"	1	50.0	50	
Totals	1,356		1,553	

# CALCULATION OF PUBLIC FIRE PROTECTION CHARGE PER EQUIVALENT CONNECTION BASED UPON ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE

Total costs to be recovered from fire protection, see page 36		\$224,386
Less: Annual charge per equivalent connection Times private sprinkler equivalent connections	\$1,110.82 14.5556	
Sub-total		(16,169)
Annual charge per equivalent connection Times equivalent private fire hydrants	\$1,110.82 20	
Sub-total		(22,216)
Remaining cost to be recovered through the monthly public fire protection charges		\$186,001
Total public fire protection revenues to be recovered Divided by total equivalent connections		\$186,001 1,553
Proposed annual charge per equivalent connection		\$119.77
Proposed monthly charge per equivalent connection		\$9.98

# ALLOCATION OF ANNUAL PUBLIC FIRE PROTECTION REVENUE BY METER SIZE

Meter Size	Proposed Annual Charge Per Equivalent Connection	Equivalency Factor	Proposed Annual Charge Per Connection	Total Number of Connections	Annual Revenues Required
5/8"	\$119.77	1.0	\$119.77	1,331	\$159,414
3/4"	119.77	1.5	179.66	<b>H</b> O	*
1"	119.77	2.5	299.43	10	2,994
1 1/4"	119.77	4.0	479.08		=
1 1/2"	119.77	5.0	598.85	1	599
2"	119.77	8.0	958.16	9	8,623
3"	119.77	15.0	1,796.55	3	5,390
4"	119.77	25.0	2,994.25	1	2,994
6"	119.77	50.0	5,988.50	1	5,989
8"	119.77	80.0	9,581.60	Ē	
10"	119.77	115.0	13,773.55	¥	
Estimated total	revenue				186,003
Annual public f	Tire protection revenue	to be recovered (p	page 40)		(186,001)
	Variance				\$2_

# SUMMARY OF MONTHLY PUBLIC FIRE PROTECTION CHARGES BASED UPON ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE

Meter Size	Proposed Annual Charge	Divided by 12 Months	Proposed Monthly Charge	
· <del></del>		<del></del>		
5/8"	\$119.77	12	\$9.98	
3/4"	179.66	12	14.97	
1"	299.43	12	24.95	
1 1/4"	479.08	12	39.92	
1 1/2"	598.85	12	49.90	
2"	958.16	12	79.85	
3"	1,796.55	12	149.71	
4"	2,994.25	12	249.52	
6"	5,988.50	12	499.04	
8"	9,581.60	12	798.47	
10"	13,773.55	12	1,147.80	

# COMPARISON OF ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE WITH REVENUE UNDER ADJUSTED RATES

	Cost of	Revenue Under Existing	Increase (I	Decrease)	Revenue Under Adjusted	Variance Between	ı Adiusted
Customer Classification	Service	Rates	%	Amount	Rates	Revenues and Cost of Service	
Residential	\$2,999,621	\$2,405,430	24.70	\$594,191	\$2,999,544	(\$77)	0.00%
Commercial	145,392	108,908	33.50	36,484	146,590	1,198	0.82%
Industrial	1,889,800	1,333,079	41.76	556,721	1,888,865	(935)	-0.05%
Government	67,253	67,542	(0.43)	(289)	65,972	(1,281)	-1.90%
Wholesale	1,251,349	883,755	41.59	367,594	1,253,159	1,810	0.14%
Fire Protection	224,386	204,160	9.91	20,226	224,386		0.00%
Totals	\$6,577,801	\$5,002,874	31.48	\$1,574,927	\$6,578,516	\$715	0.01%

#### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING REVENUE AT ADJUSTED RATES AND CHARGES BASED UPON ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE

						Allocated	Projected
				Billing Determinants		Cost of	Revenue
			Percent	Annual	Equivalent	Service	Under
			of Use	Consumption	Bills/Bills	Rates	Adjusted Rates
Residential:			%	(1,000's of gals.)		333330	
Service Charge:			15.5	(1,1-1-1,11, 2,111)			
Meters and ser	rvices				95,424	\$6.00	\$572,544
Billing and co					93,180	4.50	419,310
Volume Charge:	neering				22,100	1.50	413,510
First	10,000	gallons	81.85	326,524.7		5.10	1,665,276
		-	17.92			4.74	
Next	240,000	gallons		71,480.0			338,815
Next	250,000	gallons	0.23	911.1		3.95	3,599
Over	500,000	gallons	- <del> </del>			3.55	
Sub-totals			100.00	398,915.7			2,999,544
Commercial:							
Service Charge:							
Meters and ser					3,300	6.00	19,800
Billing and co	llecting				1,980	4.50	8,910
Volume Charge:							
First	10,000	gallons	23.57	5,877.0		5.10	29,973
Next	240,000	gallons	65.02	16,214.4		4.74	76,856
Next	250,000	gallons	9.48	2,364.4		3.95	9,339
Over	500,000	-	1.93	482.3		3.55	1,712
Sub-totals		<del></del>	100.00	24,938.0			146,590
Suo-totals			100.00	27,230.0			140,090
Industrial:							
Service Charge:							
Meters and ser	rvices				1,584	6.00	9,504
Billing and co					120	4.50	540
Volume Charge:	neeting				-		
First	10,000	gallons	0.14	709.7		5.10	3,619
Next	240,000	gallons	1.47	7,702,7		4.74	36,511
			1.14	22,704,000,000		3.95	23,700
Next	250,000	gallons		6,000.0			
Over	500,000	gallons	97.26	511,265.0		3.55	1,814,991
Sub-totals			100.00	525,677.4			1,888,865
Government:							
Service Charge:							
Meters and ser	vices				2,028	6.00	12,168
Billing and co					456	4.50	2,052
Volume Charge:	neering				1.00	1.50	
First	10.000	millone	14.07	1,587.9		5.10	8,098
	240,000	gallons				4.74	
Next	CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE	**************************************	66.73	7,529.4			35,689
Next	250,000		6.08	686.2		3.95	2,710
Over	500,000	gallons	13.12	1,480.2		3,55	5,255
Sub-totals			100.00	11,283.7			65,972
Whalacale:							
Wholesale:							
Volume Charge:	100 11		100.00	242 1257		2 61	1 262 160
Charge per 1,0	oo ganons		100.00	347,135.6		3.61	1,253,159
Fire Protection							224,386
Total							\$6,578,516
1001							= 50,570,510

# COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND ADJUSTED MONTHLY BILLS AT SELECTED USAGE AMOUNTS BASED UPON ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE

Meter Size	Monthly Usag	e		Monthl		lly Bill	
	4		Current	Adjusted	Increas	e/Decrease	
Metered Users				\$ <u></u>	(Dollars)	(%)	
5/8 inch meter	0	gallons	\$7.85	\$10.50	\$2.65	33.8%	
	1,000	gallons	12.29	15.60	3.31	26.9%	
	2,000	gallons	16.73	20.70	3.97	23.7%	
	3,000	gallons	21.17	25.80	4.63	21.9%	
	4,000	gallons	25.61	30.90	5.29	20.7%	
	5,000	gallons	30.05	36.00	5.95	19.8%	
	10,000	gallons	52.25	61.50	9.25	17.7%	
1 inch meter	25,000	gallons	107.25	141.60	34.35	32.0%	
	50,000	gallons	196.25	260.10	63.85	32.5%	
	100,000	gallons	374.25	497.10	122.85	32.8%	
6 inch meter	1,000,000	gallons	3,087.70	4,255.30	1,167.60	37.8%	
	10,000,000	gallons	25,947.70	36,205.30	10,257.60	39.5%	
	20,000,000	gallons	51,347.70	71,705.30	20,357.60	39.6%	
	30,000,000	gallons	76,747.70	107,205.30	30,457.60	39.7%	
Wholesale Users							
	1,000,000	gallons	2,540.00	3,610.00	1,070.00	42.1%	
	5,000,000	gallons	12,700.00	18,050.00	5,350.00	42.1%	
	10,000,000	gallons	25,400.00	36,100.00	10,700.00	42.1%	

### SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED WATER RATES AND CHARGES BASED UPON ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE

			Rate Per 1,00	0 Gallons
Metered Usa	ige Per Month		Present	Proposed
-		367	****	
First		gallons	\$4.44	\$5.10
Next	240,000		3.56	4.74
Next	250,000		3.33	3.95
Over	500,000	gallons	2.54	3,55
Monthly Ser	vice Charge		2	4
			Per Mo	
Meter Size			Present	Proposed
5/8	inch		\$7.85	\$10.50
3/4	inch		8.30	13.50
1	inch		9.45	19.50
I 1/4	inch		10.20	28.45
1 1/2	inch		11.00	34.45
2	inch		15.35	52.45
3	inch		47.20	94.40
4	inch		58.95	154.35
6	inch		86.40	304.20
8	inch		117.95	484.05
10	inch		153.30	693.85
Wholesale C	ustomers		Present	Proposed
Rate per 1,00	00 gallons (Subjec	t to contract minimums)	\$2.54	\$3.61
			Per Mo	nth
Monthly Pub	olic Fire Protection	Charge	Present	Proposed
	tin customers)			
70.000 EU 45			***	***
5/8 inch m			\$8.74	\$9.98
3/4 inch m			13.14	14.97
1 inch n			21.88	24.95
1 1/4 inch m			34.99	39.92
1 1/2 inch m			43.75	49.90
2 inch m			70.00	79.85
3 inch m			131.25	149.71
4 inch m			218.74	249.52
6 inch m			437.47	499.04
8 inch m			699.97	798.47
10 inch m	neter		1,006.19	1,147.80

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

### SUMMARY OF ADJUSTED WATER RATES AND CHARGES BASED UPON ALLOCATED COST OF SERVICE

	Per Annum			
Fire Protection Charges (Cont'd)	Present	Proposed		
Private fire hydrant rental	\$1,061.56	\$1,110.82		
Automatic sprinkler:	1981811 2981	A19417-A1941		
1 inch connection	29.48	30.86		
2 inch connection	117.96	123.42		
3 inch connection	165.40	277.71		
4 inch connection	471.81	493.69		
6 inch connection	1,061.56	1,110.82		
8 inch connection	1,887.23	1,974.79		
10 inch connection	2,948.81	3,085.61		
12 inch connection	4,246.27	4,443.28		
Tapping Fee				
5/8 inch meter	\$1,380.00	\$1,380.00		
Larger meters	At cost	At cost		
Customer Deposit	\$70.00	\$70.00		
Discontinuance of Service and Re-Connection Charge	\$45.00	\$45.00		
Disconnect Charge	\$25.00	\$25.00		
Bad Check Charge	\$25.00	\$25.00		
Credit/Debit Card Charge				
- Residential and small commercial	\$0.80	\$0.80		
- All other (based on total transaction amount)	2.00%	2.00%		

Present rates adopted by IURC Cause No. 44987, dated July 25, 2018. The Tariff was approved July 25, 2018.

COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS - PHASED-IN

#### CALCULATION OF SUBSIDY TO BE PHASED OUT

				Required		
	Revenue			Revenues		
	Under	Allocated		with	50%	Adjusted
	Existing	Cost of		Across the	of Remaining	Cost of
Customer Class:	Rates	Service	Increase	Board Increase	Increase	Service
				(1)	(2)	
Industrial	\$1,333,079	\$1,889,800	\$556,721	\$1,752,738	\$68,531	\$1,821,269
Wholesale	883,755	1,251,349	367,594	1,161,965	44,692	1,206,657
Totals	\$2,216,834	\$3,141,149	\$924,315	\$2,914,703	\$113,223	\$3,027,926

<sup>(1)</sup> Revenues required if doing an across-the-board increase. Reflects an increase of 31.5%. See page 21.

<sup>(2)</sup> Only including 50% of remaining increase over and above the across-the-board rate increase for industrial and wholesale customer classes to ease effect of rate increase.

#### CALCULATION OF ADJUSTED COST OF SERVICE

	Revenue Under			Adjusted	
Customer Class:	Existing Rates	Cost of Service	Subsidy	Cost of Service	% Increase
Customer Class.	Rates	Scrvice	(1)	Scrvice	Increase
Residential	\$2,405,430	\$2,999,621	\$110,740	\$3,110,361	29.31
Commercial	108,908	145,392		145,392	33.50
Industrial	1,333,079	1,889,800	(68,531)	1,821,269	36.62
Government	67,542	67,253	2,483	69,736	3.25
Wholesale	883,755	1,251,349	(44,692)	1,206,657	36.54
Fire Protection	204,160	224,386	¥	224,386	9.91
Totals	\$5,002,874	\$6,577,801	\$ -	\$6,577,801	31.48

<sup>(1)</sup> Subsidy for Industrial and Wholesale rates is allocated prorata to the Residential and Government customer classes.

# COMPARISON OF ADJUSTED COST OF SERVICE WITH REVENUE UNDER PROPOSED RATES

	Adjusted Cost of	Revenue Under Existing	Proposed Increa	ase (Decrease)	Revenue Under Proposed	Variance Betwee	n Proposed
Customer Classification	Service	Rates	%	Amount	Rates	Revenues and Cos	st of Service
Residential	\$3,110,361	\$2,405,430	29.31	\$704,931	\$3,109,537	(S824)	-0.03%
Commercial	145,392	108,908	33.50	36,484	150,839	5,447	3.75%
Industrial	1,821,269	1,333,079	36.62	488,190	1,821,354	85	0.00%
Government	69,736	67,542	3.25	2,194	67,177	(2,559)	-3.67%
Wholesale	1,206,657	883,755	36.54	322,902	1,204,560	(2,097)	-0.17%
Fire Protection	224,386	204,160	9.91	20,226	224,386	# R	0.00%
Totals	\$6,577,801	\$5,002,874	31.48	\$1,574,927	\$6,577,853	\$52	0.00%

### ESTIMATED ANNUAL OPERATING REVENUE AT PROPOSED RATES AND CHARGES

						Allocated	Projected
				Billing Dete	rminants	Cost of	Revenue
			Percent	Annual	Equivalent	Service	Under
			of Usc	Consumption	Bills/Bills	Rates	Adjusted Rates
Residential:			%	(1,000's of gals.)			The state of the s
Service Charge:							
Meters and serv	rices				95,424	\$6.00	\$572,544
Billing and coll	ecting				93,180	4.50	419,310
Volume Charge:							
First	10,000	gallons	81.85	326,524.7		5.42	1,769,764
Next	240,000	gallons	17.92	71,480.0		4.81	343,819
Next	250,000	gallons	0.23	911.1		4.50	4,100
Over	500,000	gallons	= =			3.41	
Sub-totals			100.00	398,915.7			3,109,537_
Commercial:							
Service Charge:							
Meters and serv	rices				3,300	6.00	19,800
Billing and coll-					1,980	4,50	8,910
Volume Charge:							
First	10,000	THE CONTRACTOR OF THE	23.57	5,877.0		5.42	31,853
Next	240,000		65.02	16,214.4		4.81	77,991
Next	250,000	gallons	9.48	2,364.4		4.50	10,640
Over	500,000	gallons	1.93	482.3		3.41	1,645
Sub-totals			100.00	24,938.0			150,839
Industrial:							
Service Charge:							
Meters and serv	ices				1,584	6.00	9,504
Billing and colle					120	4.50	540
Volume Charge:					358		070170
First	10,000	gallons	0.14	709.7		5.42	3,846
Next	240,000	-	1.47	7,702.7		4.81	37,050
Next	250,000	gallons	1.14	6,000.0		4.50	27,000
Over	500,000		97.26	511,265.0		3,41	1,743,414
Sub-totals			100.00	525,677.4			1,821,354
Government:							
Service Charge:							
Meters and serv	5000				2,028	6.00	10.160
Billing and colle					456		12,168
	ecting				430	4.50	2,052
Volume Charge:	10.000	11	14.07	1 507.0		5 40	0.606
First	10,000		14.07	1,587.9		5.42	8,606
Next	250,000	gallons	66.73	7,529.4		4.81	36,216
Next	240,000	gallons	6.08	686.2		4.50	3,088
Over	500,000	gallons	13.12	1,480.2		3.41	5,047
Sub-totals			100,00	11,283.7			67,177
Wholesale:							
Volume Charge:							
Charge per 1,00	0 pallons		100.00	347,135.6		3.47	1,204,560
Charge per 1,000	- Burrous		100.00			D-71	1,5007,5000
Fire Protection							224,386
Total							\$6,577,853

# COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED MONTHLY BILLS AT SELECTED USAGE AMOUNTS BASED UPON ADJUSTED COST OF SERVICE

Meter Size	Monthly Usag	ge		Monthly		y Bill	
			Current	Adjusted		se/Decrease	
Metered Users					(Dollars)	(%)	
5/8 inch meter	0	gallons	\$7.85	\$10.50	\$2.65	33.8%	
	1,000	gallons	12.29	15.92	3.63	29.5%	
	2,000	gallons	16.73	21.34	4.61	27.6%	
	3,000	gallons	21.17	26.76	5.59	26.4%	
	4,000	gallons	25.61	32.18	6.57	25.7%	
	5,000	gallons	30.05	37.60	7.55	25.1%	
	10,000	gallons	52.25	64.70	12.45	23.8%	
1 inch meter	25,000	gallons	107.25	145.85	38.60	36.0%	
	50,000	gallons	196.25	266.10	69.85	35.6%	
	100,000	gallons	374.25	506.60	132.35	35.4%	
6 inch meter	1,000,000	gallons	3,087.70	4,342.80	1,255.10	40.6%	
	10,000,000	gallons	25,947.70	35,032.80	9,085.10	35.0%	
	20,000,000	gallons	51,347.70	69,132.80	17,785.10	34.6%	
	30,000,000	gallons	76,747.70	103,232.80	26,485.10	34.5%	
Wholesale Users							
	1,000,000	gallons	2,540.00	3,470.00	930.00	36.6%	
	5,000,000	gallons	12,700.00	17,350.00	4,650.00	36.6%	
	10,000,000	gallons	25,400.00	34,700.00	9,300.00	36.6%	

#### SUMMARY OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED WATER RATES AND CHARGES

			Rate Per 1,0	00 Gallons	
Metered Usas	ge Per Month		Present	Proposed	
				(1)	
First	10,000	gallons	\$4.44	\$5.42	
Next	240,000	gallons	3.56	4.81	
Next	250,000		3.33	4.50	
Over	500,000	gallons	2.54	3.41	
Monthly Serv	vice Charge				
			Per M		
Meter Size		3	Present	Proposed	
			925 200 200	(1)	
5/8	inch		\$7.85	\$10.50	
3/4	inch		8.30	13.50	
1	inch		9.45	19.50	
1 1/4	inch		10.20	28.45	
1 1/2	inch		11.00	34.45	
2	inch		15.35	52.45	
3	inch		47.20	94.40	
4	inch		58.95	154.35	
6	inch		86.40	304.20	
8	inch		117.95	484.05	
10	inch		153.30	693.85	
Wholesale Cu	ustomers		Present	Proposed	
				(1)	
Rate per 1,00	0 gallons (Subjec	t to contract minimums)	\$2.54	\$3.47	
			Per Month		
Monthly Pub	lic Fire Protection	Charge	Present	Proposed	
(City of Aust	in customers)			(1)	
5/8 inch m	eter		\$8.74	\$9.98	
3/4 inch m			13.14	14.97	
1 inch m			21.88	24.95	
1 1/4 inch m			34.99	39.92	
1 1/2 inch m			43.75	49.90	
2 inch m			70.00	79.85	
3 inch m		131.25	149.71		
4 inch m			218.74	249.52	
6 inch m			437.47	499.04	
8 inch m			699.97	798.47	
10 inch m			1,006.19	1,147.80	
10 men m	cici		1,000.15	1,147.80	

53

(See Consultant's Report)

(Continued on next page)

#### SUMMARY OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED WATER RATES AND CHARGES

	Per Annum			
Fire Protection Charges (Cont'd)	Present	Proposed		
		(1)		
Private fire hydrant rental	\$1,061.56	\$1,110.82		
Automatic sprinkler:				
1 inch connection	29.48	30.86		
2 inch connection	117.96	123.42		
3 inch connection	165.40	277.71		
4 inch connection	471.81	493.69		
6 inch connection	1,061.56	1,110.82		
8 inch connection	1,887.23	1,974.79		
10 inch connection	2,948.81	3,085.61		
12 inch connection	4,246.27	4,443.28		
Tapping Fee				
5/8 inch meter	\$1,380.00	\$1,380.00		
Larger meters	At cost	At cost		
Customer Deposit	\$70.00	\$70.00		
Discontinuance of Service and Re-Connection Charge	\$45.00	\$45.00		
Disconnect Charge	\$25.00	\$25.00		
Bad Check Charge	\$25.00	\$25.00		
Credit/Debit Card Charge				
- Residential and small commercial	\$0.80	\$0.80		
- All other	2.00%	2.00%		

<sup>(1)</sup> Reflects an inclusion of a 50% subsidy for the industrial and wholesale customer classes.

SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCIAL DATA

#### COMPARISON OF ACCOUNT BALANCES WITH MINIMUM BALANCES REQUIRED

	Account Balance	Minimum Balance		
	12/31/2023	Required (1)	Ref.	Variance
Account:				·
Operation and Maintenance:				
Operating	\$846,151	\$352,333	(2)	\$493,818
Periodic Maintenance	665,321	665,321	(3)	2
Sinking:				
Bond and Interest	86,133	86,133	(4)	
Debt Service Reserve	712,130	697,216	(5)	14,914
Customer Deposits	450,490	450,490	(6)	14
Improvement	821,438	990,030	(7)	(168,592)
Construction	8,500	8,500	(8)	
Totals	\$3,590,163	\$3,250,023		\$340,140

- (1) Balances required per Bond Resolution 2019-1.
- (2) The balance maintained in the operation and maintenance account should be sufficient to pay the expenses of operation, repair, and maintenance of the utility for the next succeeding two (2) calendar months.

Estimated operation and maintenance expense Times factor for 2 months	\$4,155,135 0.1667
Sub-total Less tank painting annual amount transferred	692,661 (340,328)
Minimum Balance Required	\$352,333

(3) Account restricted per IURC Order in Cause No. 44987. The balance in this account should be equal to the agreed annual amount transferred of \$340,328 less any monies expended for periodic maintenance items.

Annual transfer requirement	\$340,328	
Divided by 12 months	12	
Monthly transfer	28,361	
Times 63 months (for October 2018 through December 2023)	63	
Sub-total		\$1,786,743
Add beginning balance as of 7/25/2018 (Tariff Approved)		72,930
Less funds used for periodic maintenance	1	(1,194,352)
Minimum Balance Recommended		\$665,321

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

#### COMPARISON OF ACCOUNT BALANCES WITH MINIMUM BALANCES REQUIRED

(4) A balance sufficient to provide for the principal and interest due on the next payment date must be accumulated before transfers may be made.

	Amount		Factor	Total	
2014 Refunding Bonds					
Principal due 1/1/25	\$280,000	x	0/12	\$ 2	
Interest due 7/1/24	8,475	x	0/6	2	
2014 Bonds					
Principal due 1/1/25	3	X	0/12		
Interest due 7/1/24	77,213	X	0/6	<u>=</u>	
2017 Bonds					
Principal due 1/1/25	120,000	X	0/12	2	
Interest due 7/1/24	38,725	х	0/6	20	
2020 Refunding Bonds					
Principal due 1/1/25	235,000	X	0/12	5	
Interest due 7/1/24	60,825	x	0/6	3	
2020 RD Bonds					
Principal due 1/1/24	20,000	х	12/12	20,000	
Interest due 1/1/24	66,133	x	6/6	66,133	
Minimum Balance Required				\$86,133	

(5) The balance in this account should be equal to maximum annual debt service on the 2014 Refunding Bonds, 2014 Bonds and 2017 Bonds to be accumulated over a five year period from the date of delivery on the 2017 Bonds. The 2020 Refunding Bonds requirement is secured by a debt service reserve surety. The 2020 RD Bonds requirement will be held as a separate reserve and should be equal to the average annual debt service on the 2020 RD Bonds to be accumulated over a ten year period from the date of delivery on the 2020 RD Bonds.

Debt service reserve requirement (2014 Ref. Bonds, 2014 Bonds and 2017 Bonds)		\$650,300
Debt service reserve requirement (2020 RD Bonds)	\$152,112	
Divided by 120 months	120	
Sub-total	1,268	
Times 37 months for December 2020 through December 2023 transfers	37	
Sub-total	-	46,916
Minimum Balance Required		\$697,216

- (6) Account fully restricted.
- (7) No minimum balance is required. However, it is suggested that an amount equal to one year's depreciation expense be reserved for replacements and improvements.

Minimum Balance Recommended	\$990,030

(8) Account fully restricted for project related costs.

# SCHEDULE OF AMORTIZATION OF \$835,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING WATERWORKS REFUNDING REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2014

# Principal payable annually, January 1st. Interest payable semi-annually, January 1st and July 1st. Interest rate as indicated.

Payment	Principal	Interest		Bond Year		
Date	Balance	Rate	Principal	Interest	Total	Total
	(In \$1,000s)	(%)	(In \$1,000s)	(	In Dollars	)
01/01/24	\$835	3.00	\$270	\$12,525.00	\$282,525.00	\$282,525.00
07/01/24	565			8,475.00	8,475.00	
01/01/25	565	3.00	280	8,475.00	288,475.00	296,950.00
07/01/25	285			4,275.00	4,275.00	
01/01/26	285	3.00	285	4,275.00	289,275.00	293,550.00
Totals			\$835	\$38,025.00	\$873,025.00	\$873,025.00

# SCHEDULE OF AMORTIZATION OF \$4,000,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING WATERWORKS REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2014

# Principal payable annually, January 1st. Interest payable semi-annually, January 1st and July 1st. Interest rates as indicated.

Payment Principal		Interest		Debt Service		Bond Year
Date	Balance	Rates	Principal	Interest	Total	Total
<del> </del>	(In \$1,000s)	(%)	(In \$1,000s)	(	In Dollars	)
01/01/24	\$4,000			\$77,212.50	\$77,212.50	\$77,212.50
07/01/24	4,000			77,212.50	77,212.50	
01/01/25	4,000			77,212.50	77,212.50	154,425.00
07/01/25	4,000			77,212.50	77,212.50	
01/01/26	4,000			77,212.50	77,212.50	154,425.00
07/01/26	4,000			77,212.50	77,212.50	
01/01/27	4,000	3.25	\$270	77,212.50	347,212.50	424,425.00
07/01/27	3,730			72,825.00	72,825.00	
01/01/28	3,730	3.25	280	72,825.00	352,825.00	425,650.00
07/01/28	3,450			68,275.00	68,275.00	
01/01/29	3,450	3.50	290	68,275.00	358,275.00	426,550.00
07/01/29	3,160			63,200.00	63,200.00	
01/01/30	3,160	4.00	295	63,200.00	358,200.00	421,400.00
07/01/30	2,865			57,300.00	57,300.00	
01/01/31	2,865	4.00	310	57,300.00	367,300.00	424,600.00
07/01/31	2,555			51,100.00	51,100.00	
01/01/32	2,555	4.00	325	51,100.00	376,100.00	427,200.00
07/01/32	2,230			44,600.00	44,600.00	
01/01/33	2,230	4.00	340	44,600.00	384,600.00	429,200.00
07/01/33	1,890			37,800.00	37,800.00	
01/01/34	1,890	4.00	345	37,800.00	382,800.00	420,600.00
07/01/34	1,545			30,900.00	30,900.00	
01/01/35	1,545	4.00	360	30,900.00	390,900.00	421,800.00
07/01/35	1,185			23,700.00	23,700.00	
01/01/36	1,185	4.00	380	23,700.00	403,700.00	427,400.00
07/01/36	805			16,100.00	16,100.00	
01/01/37	805	4.00	395	16,100.00	411,100.00	427,200.00
07/01/37	410			8,200.00	8,200.00	
01/01/38	410	4.00	410	8,200.00	418,200.00	426,400.00
Totals			\$4,000	\$1,488,487.50	\$5,488,487.50	\$5,488,487.50

## SCHEDULE OF AMORTIZATION OF \$2,475,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING WATERWORKS REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2017

Principal payable annually, January 1st.

Interest payable semi-annually, January 1st and July 1st.

Interest rates as indicated.

Payment	yment Principal Interest Debt Service					Bond Year
Date	Balance	Rates	Principal	Interest	Total	Total
-	(In \$1,000's)	(%)	(In \$1,000's)	(	In Dollars	)
01/01/24	\$2,475	2.25	\$115	\$40,018.75	\$155,018.75	\$155,018.75
07/01/24	2,360			38,725.00	38,725.00	
01/01/25	2,360	2.50	120	38,725.00	158,725.00	197,450.00
07/01/25	2,240			37,225.00	37,225.00	
01/01/26	2,240	2.50	120	37,225.00	157,225.00	194,450.00
07/01/26	2,120			35,725.00	35,725.00	
01/01/27	2,120	2.75	150	35,725.00	185,725.00	221,450.00
07/01/27	1,970			33,662.50	33,662.50	
01/01/28	1,970	2.75	155	33,662.50	188,662.50	222,325.00
07/01/28	1,815			31,531.25	31,531.25	
01/01/29	1,815	3.00	155	31,531.25	186,531.25	218,062.50
07/01/29	1,660			29,206.25	29,206.25	
01/01/30	1,660	3.00	165	29,206.25	194,206.25	223,412.50
07/01/30	1,495			26,731.25	26,731.25	
01/01/31	1,495	3.25	165	26,731.25	191,731.25	218,462.50
07/01/31	1,330			24,050.00	24,050.00	
01/01/32	1,330	3.25	175	24,050.00	199,050.00	223,100.00
07/01/32	1,155			21,206.25	21,206.25	
01/01/33	1,155	3.50	175	21,206.25	196,206.25	217,412.50
07/01/33	980			18,143.75	18,143.75	
01/01/34	980	3.50	185	18,143.75	203,143.75	221,287.50
07/01/34	795			14,906.25	14,906.25	
01/01/35	795	3.75	190	14,906.25	204,906.25	219,812.50
07/01/35	605			11,343.75	11,343.75	
01/01/36	605	3.75	195	11,343.75	206,343.75	217,687.50
07/01/36	410			7,687.50	7,687.50	
01/01/37	410	3.75	205	7,687.50	212,687.50	220,375.00
07/01/37	205			3,843.75	3,843.75	
01/01/38	205	3.75	205	3,843.75	208,843.75	212,687.50
3	Totals		\$2,475	\$707,993.75	\$3,182,993.75	\$3,182,993.75

## SCHEDULE OF AMORTIZATION OF \$4,285,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING WATERWORKS REFUNDING REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2020

# Principal payable annually, January 1st. Interest payable semi-annually, January 1st and July 1st. Interest rate as indicated.

Payment	Principal	Interest		Debt Service		Bond Year
Date	Balance	Rate	Principal	Interest	Total	Total
	(In \$1,000's)	(%)	(In \$1,000's)	(	In Dollars	)
01/01/24	\$4,285	3.00	\$230	\$64,275.00	\$294,275.00	\$294,275.00
07/01/24	4,055			60,825.00	60,825.00	
01/01/25	4,055	3.00	235	60,825.00	295,825.00	356,650.00
07/01/25	3,820			57,300.00	57,300.00	5
01/01/26	3,820	3.00	245	57,300.00	302,300.00	359,600.00
07/01/26	3,575			53,625.00	53,625.00	
01/01/27	3,575	3.00	250	53,625.00	303,625.00	357,250.00
07/01/27	3,325			49,875.00	49,875.00	
01/01/28	3,325	3.00	260	49,875.00	309,875.00	359,750.00
07/01/28	3,065			45,975.00	45,975.00	
01/01/29	3,065	3.00	270	45,975.00	315,975.00	361,950.00
07/01/29	2,795			41,925.00	41,925.00	
01/01/30	2,795	3.00	275	41,925.00	316,925.00	358,850.00
07/01/30	2,520			37,800.00	37,800.00	
01/01/31	2,520	3.00	285	37,800.00	322,800.00	360,600.00
07/01/31	2,235			33,525.00	33,525.00	
01/01/32	2,235	3.00	290	33,525.00	323,525.00	357,050.00
07/01/32	1,945			29,175.00	29,175.00	
01/01/33	1,945	3.00	300	29,175.00	329,175.00	358,350.00
07/01/33	1,645			24,675.00	24,675.00	
01/01/34	1,645	3.00	310	24,675.00	334,675.00	359,350.00
07/01/34	1,335			20,025.00	20,025.00	
01/01/35	1,335	3.00	320	20,025.00	340,025.00	360,050.00
07/01/35	1,015			15,225.00	15,225.00	
01/01/36	1,015	3.00	330	15,225.00	345,225.00	360,450.00
07/01/36	685			10,275.00	10,275.00	
01/01/37	685	3.00	335	10,275.00	345,275.00	355,550.00
07/01/37	350			5,250.00	5,250.00	
01/01/38	350	3.00	350	5,250.00	355,250.00	360,500.00
Т	otals		\$4,285	\$1,035,225.00	\$5,320,225.00	\$5,320,225.00

# SCHEDULE OF AMORTIZATION OF \$2,341,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING TAXABLE WATERWORKS REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2020

Principal payable annually, January 1st.
Interest payable semi-annually, January 1st and July 1st.
Interest rate as indicated.

Payment	Principal	Interest		Debt Service		Bond Year	
Date	Balance	Rate	Principal Interest		Total	Total	
	(In \$1,000's)	(%)	(In \$1,000's)	(	In Dollars	)	
01/01/24	\$2,341	5.650	\$20	\$66,133.25	\$86,133.25	\$86,133.25	
07/01/24	2,321			65,568.25	65,568.25		
01/01/25	2,321	5.650	21	65,568.25	86,568.25	152,136.50	
07/01/25	2,300			64,975.00	64,975.00		
01/01/26	2,300	5.650	22	64,975.00	86,975.00	151,950.00	
07/01/26	2,278			64,353.50	64,353.50		
01/01/27	2,278	5.650	23	64,353.50	87,353.50	151,707.00	
07/01/27	2,255			63,703.75	63,703.75		
01/01/28	2,255	5.650	25	63,703.75	88,703.75	152,407.50	
07/01/28	2,230			62,997.50	62,997.50		
01/01/29	2,230	5.650	26	62,997.50	88,997.50	151,995.00	
07/01/29	2,204			62,263.00	62,263.00		
01/01/30	2,204	5.650	28	62,263.00	90,263.00	152,526.00	
07/01/30	2,176			61,472.00	61,472.00		
01/01/31	2,176	5.650	29	61,472.00	90,472.00	151,944.00	
07/01/31	2,147			60,652.75	60,652.75		
01/01/32	2,147	5.650	31	60,652.75	91,652.75	152,305.50	
07/01/32	2,116			59,777.00	59,777.00		
01/01/33	2,116	5.650	33	59,777.00	92,777.00	152,554.00	
07/01/33	2,083			58,844.75	58,844.75		
01/01/34	2,083	5.650	34	58,844,75	92,844.75	151,689.50	
07/01/34	2,049			57,884.25	57,884.25		
01/01/35	2,049	5.650	36	57,884.25	93,884.25	151,768.50	
07/01/35	2,013			56,867.25	56,867.25		
01/01/36	2,013	5.650	39	56,867.25	95,867.25	152,734.50	
07/01/36	1,974			55,765.50	55,765.50		
01/01/37	1,974	5.650	41	55,765.50	96,765.50	152,531.00	
07/01/37	1,933			54,607.25	54,607.25		
01/01/38	1,933	5.650	43	54,607.25	97,607.25	152,214.50	
07/01/38	1,890			53,392.50	53,392.50		
01/01/39	1,890	5.650	45	53,392.50	98,392.50	151,785.00	
07/01/39	1,845			52,121.25	52,121.25		
01/01/40	1,845	5.650	48	52,121.25	100,121.25	152,242.50	
Subtotals carr	ried forward		\$544	\$1,976,624.25	\$2,520,624.25	\$2,520,624.25	

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

### SCHEDULE OF AMORTIZATION OF \$2,341,000 PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING TAXABLE WATERWORKS REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2020

# Principal payable annually, January 1st. Interest payable semi-annually, January 1st and July 1st. Interest rate as indicated.

Payment	Principal	Interest		Debt Service		Bond Year
Date	Balance	Rate	Principal	Interest	Total	Total
	(In \$1,000's)	(%)	(In \$1,000's)	(	In Dollars	)
Subtotals carr	ried forward		\$544	\$1,976,624.25	\$2,520,624.25	\$2,520,624.25
07/01/40	\$1,797			50,765.25	50,765.25	
01/01/41	1,797	5.650	51	50,765.25	101,765.25	152,530.50
07/01/41	1,746			49,324.50	49,324.50	
01/01/42	1,746	5.650	54	49,324.50	103,324.50	152,649.00
07/01/42	1,692			47,799.00	47,799.00	
01/01/43	1,692	5.650	57	47,799.00	104,799.00	152,598.00
07/01/43	1,635			46,188.75	46,188.75	
01/01/44	1,635	5.650	60	46,188.75	106,188.75	152,377.50
07/01/44	1,575			44,493.75	44,493.75	
01/01/45	1,575	5.650	63	44,493.75	107,493.75	151,987.50
07/01/45	1,512			42,714.00	42,714.00	
01/01/46	1,512	5.650	67	42,714.00	109,714.00	152,428.00
07/01/46	1,445			40,821.25	40,821.25	
01/01/47	1,445	5.650	70	40,821.25	110,821.25	151,642.50
07/01/47	1,375			38,843.75	38,843.75	
01/01/48	1,375	5.650	74	38,843.75	112,843.75	151,687.50
07/01/48	1,301			36,753.25	36,753.25	
01/01/49	1,301	5.650	79	36,753.25	115,753.25	152,506.50
07/01/49	1,222			34,521.50	34,521.50	
01/01/50	1,222	5.650	83	34,521.50	117,521.50	152,043.00
07/01/50	1,139			32,176.75	32,176.75	
01/01/51	1,139	5.650	88	32,176.75	120,176.75	152,353.50
07/01/51	1,051			29,690.75	29,690.75	
01/01/52	1,051	5.650	93	29,690.75	122,690.75	152,381.50
07/01/52	958			27,063.50	27,063.50	
01/01/53	958	5.650	98	27,063.50	125,063.50	152,127.00
07/01/53	860			24,295.00	24,295.00	
01/01/54	860	5.650	104	24,295.00	128,295.00	152,590.00
07/01/54	756			21,357.00	21,357.00	
01/01/55	756	5.650	109	21,357.00	130,357.00	151,714.00
07/01/55	647			18,277.75	18,277.75	
01/01/56	647	5.650	116	18,277.75	134,277.75	152,555.50
07/01/56	531			15,000.75	15,000.75	
01/01/57	531	5.650	122	15,000.75	137,000.75	152,001.50
07/01/57	409			11,554.25	11,554.25	
01/01/58	409	5.650	129	11,554.25	140,554.25	152,108.50
07/01/58	280			7,910.00	7,910.00	
01/01/59	280	5.650	136	7,910.00	143,910.00	151,820.00
07/01/59	144			4,068.00	4,068.00	
01/01/60	144	5.650	144	4,068.00	148,068.00	152,136.00
	Totals		\$2,341	\$3,223,861.75	\$5,564,861.75	\$5,564,861.75

#### SCHEDULE OF COMBINED BOND AMORTIZATION

Payment Date	2014 Refunding Bonds	2014 Bonds	2017 Bonds	2020 Refunding Bonds	2020 Bonds	Combined	Bond Year
Date	Donds	Donds	Donds	Donda	Donas	Comonica	- T Cat
01/01/24	\$282,525.00	\$77,212.50	\$155,018.75	\$294,275.00	\$86,133.25	\$895,164.50	\$895,164.50
07/01/24	8,475.00	77,212.50	38,725.00	60,825.00	65,568.25	250,805.75	
01/01/25	288,475.00	77,212.50	158,725.00	295,825.00	86,568.25	906,805.75	1,157,611.50
07/01/25	4,275.00	77,212.50	37,225.00	57,300.00	64,975.00	240,987.50	Constitution of the Association
01/01/26	289,275.00	77,212.50	157,225.00	302,300.00	86,975.00	912,987.50	1,153,975.00
07/01/26		77,212.50	35,725.00	53,625.00	64,353.50	230,916.00	8 5
01/01/27		347,212.50	185,725.00	303,625.00	87,353.50	923,916.00	1,154,832.00
07/01/27		72,825.00	33,662.50	49,875.00	63,703.75	220,066.25	
01/01/28		352,825.00	188,662.50	309,875.00	88,703.75	940,066.25	1,160,132.50
07/01/28		68,275.00	31,531.25	45,975.00	62,997.50	208,778.75	
01/01/29		358,275,00	186,531.25	315,975.00	88,997.50	949,778.75	1,158,557.50
07/01/29		63,200.00	29,206.25	41,925.00	62,263.00	196,594.25	Print and the Land and the Control of the Control o
01/01/30		358,200.00	194,206.25	316,925.00	90,263.00	959,594.25	1,156,188.50
07/01/30		57,300.00	26,731.25	37,800.00	61,472.00	183,303.25	8 8
01/01/31		367,300.00	191,731.25	322,800.00	90,472.00	972,303.25	1,155,606.50
07/01/31		51,100.00	24,050.00	33,525.00	60,652.75	169,327.75	
01/01/32		376,100.00	199,050.00	323,525.00	91,652.75	990,327.75	1,159,655.50
07/01/32		44,600.00	21,206.25	29,175.00	59,777.00	154,758.25	
01/01/33		384,600.00	196,206.25	329,175.00	92,777.00	1,002,758.25	1,157,516.50
07/01/33		37,800.00	18,143.75	24,675.00	58,844.75	139,463.50	escalaterate Action solutions
01/01/34		382,800.00	203,143.75	334,675.00	92,844.75	1,013,463.50	1,152,927.00
07/01/34		30,900.00	14,906.25	20,025.00	57,884.25	123,715.50	
01/01/35		390,900.00	204,906.25	340,025.00	93,884.25	1,029,715.50	1,153,431.00
07/01/35		23,700.00	11,343.75	15,225.00	56,867.25	107,136.00	
01/01/36		403,700.00	206,343.75	345,225.00	95,867.25	1,051,136.00	1,158,272.00
07/01/36		16,100.00	7,687.50	10,275.00	55,765.50	89,828.00	10#220000 #vs.20000000
01/01/37		411,100.00	212,687.50	345,275.00	96,765.50	1,065,828.00	1,155,656.00
07/01/37		8,200.00	3,843.75	5,250.00	54,607.25	71,901.00	POPPORTO, P. P. C.
01/01/38		418,200.00	208,843.75	355,250.00	97,607.25	1,079,901.00	1,151,802.00
07/01/38			8	8	53,392.50	53,392.50	( 1.6)
01/01/39					98,392.50	98,392.50	151,785.00
07/01/39					52,121.25	52,121.25	3-3
01/01/40					100,121.25	100,121.25	152,242.50
07/01/40					50,765.25	50,765.25	
01/01/41					101,765.25	101,765.25	152,530.50
07/01/41					49,324.50	49,324.50	
01/01/42					103,324.50	103,324.50	152,649.00
07/01/42					47,799.00	47,799.00	
01/01/43					104,799.00	104,799.00	152,598.00
07/01/43					46,188.75	46,188.75	
01/01/44					106,188.75	106,188.75	152,377.50
07/01/44					44,493.75	44,493.75	CSERVING CONTROL OF SERVING
01/01/45		s	-		107,493.75	107,493.75	151,987.50
ubtotals	\$873,025.00	\$5,488,487.50	\$3,182,993.75	\$5,320,225.00	\$3,282,766.75	\$18,147,498.00	\$18,147,498.00

(Continued on next page)

(Cont'd)

#### SCHEDULE OF COMBINED BOND AMORTIZATION

Payment Date	2014 Refunding Bonds	2014 Bonds	2017 Bonds	2020 Refunding Bonds	2020 Bonds	Combined	Bond Year
Subtotals carried				47711 0010004400077111077 0077791			
forward	\$873,025.00	\$5,488,487.50	\$3,182,993.75	\$5,320,225.00	\$3,282,766.75	\$18,147,498.00	\$18,147,498.00
07/01/45					42,714.00	42,714.00	
01/01/46					109,714.00	109,714.00	152,428.00
07/01/46					40,821.25	40,821.25	
01/01/47					110,821.25	110,821.25	151,642.50
07/01/47					38,843.75	38,843.75	
01/01/48					112,843.75	112,843.75	151,687.50
07/01/48					36,753.25	36,753.25	
01/01/49					115,753.25	115,753.25	152,506.50
07/01/49					34,521.50	34,521.50	
01/01/50					117,521.50	117,521.50	152,043.00
07/01/50					32,176.75	32,176.75	
01/01/51					120,176.75	120,176.75	152,353.50
07/01/51					29,690.75	29,690.75	
01/01/52					122,690.75	122,690.75	152,381.50
07/01/52					27,063.50	27,063.50	
01/01/53					125,063.50	125,063.50	152,127.00
07/01/53					24,295.00	24,295.00	
01/01/54					128,295.00	128,295.00	152,590.00
07/01/54					21,357.00	21,357.00	
01/01/55					130,357.00	130,357.00	151,714.00
07/01/55					18,277.75	18,277.75	
01/01/56					134,277.75	134,277.75	152,555.50
07/01/56					15,000.75	15,000.75	
01/01/57					137,000.75	137,000.75	152,001.50
07/01/57					11,554.25	11,554.25	
01/01/58					140,554.25	140,554.25	152,108.50
07/01/58					7,910.00	7,910.00	
01/01/59					143,910.00	143,910.00	151,820.00
07/01/59					4,068.00	4,068.00	
01/01/60					148,068.00	148,068.00	152,136.00
Totals =	\$873,025.00	\$5,488,487.50	\$3,182,993.75	\$5,320,225.00	\$5,564,861.75	\$20,429,593.00	\$20,429,593.00

Average annual debt service for the five bond years ending January 1, 2031

\$1,157,063.40

# Petitioner's Exhibit 5

#### AGREEMENT REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION OF COST OF SERVICE STUDY

This Agreement Regarding Implementation of Cost of Service Study ("Agreement"), made and entered to this 25th day of November, 2024 (the "Effective Date"), between the Stucker Fork Conservancy District ("Stucker Fork") and Morgan Foods Inc., f/k/a Morgan Packing Company, Inc. ("Morgan Foods") (individually, Stucker Fork and Morgan Foods are a "Party" and collectively they are "Parties").

#### RECITALS

- A. Stucker Fork is an Indiana conservancy district created pursuant to Ind. Code Ind. Code § 14-33 et. seq. for the purpose of, among other things, providing public water supply to retail, commercial, industrial, and wholesale customers located in Scott, Jefferson, Jackson, Jennings, Washington, and Clark Counties, including Morgan Foods.
- B. Morgan Foods is an Indiana corporation that owns and operates a food processing plant ("Plant") located in Austin, Indiana, that is served by Stucker Fork.
- C. In a July 25, 2018 final order issued by the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission ("Commission") in Cause No. 44987, the Commission required Stucker Fork and Morgan Foods to meet, discuss, and hopefully resolve any cost-of-service issues between them before Stucker Fork filed its next general rate case.
- D. Earlier in 2024, the Board of Directors for Stucker Fork determined that Stucker Fork required a rate increase in order to meet its on-going expense of operating and maintaining its water system, including, but not limited to, paying the principal and interest on its outstanding and proposed bonds.
- E. Consistent with the Commission's July 25, 2018 Order, Stucker Fork and Morgan Foods have met on multiple occasions to discuss cost of service issues.
- F. Stucker Fork and Morgan Foods have now reached an agreement on the implementation of a cost of service study.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the Parties, in consideration of the mutual promises set out in this Agreement, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, agree as follows:

- 1. <u>Incorporation of Recitals</u>. The representations, covenants, and recitations set forth in the forgoing recitals are material to this Agreement and are hereby incorporated into and made part of this Agreement as if fully set forth herein.
- 2. Agreement on Implementation of Cost of Service Study. Stucker Fork has commissioned the completion of a cost of service study ("COSS") by Baker Tilly Municipal Advisors, LLC, a copy of which is attached hereto as <a href="Exhibit A">Exhibit A</a>. While the Parties have not agreed to the methodology set forth in the COSS, for purposes of settlement and subject to the Phase-in agreement set forth below, Stucker Fork and Morgan Foods hereby agree that the COSS shall be

the basis upon which Stucker Fork seeks to increase its rates and charges consistent with the terms and conditions set forth herein.

- 3. Phased in Rate Increase. Following the Commission's approval of the revised rates in the upcoming Stucker Fork rate case and consistent with the Commission's policy of gradualism, the Parties agree that Stucker Fork will implement the rates approved by the Commission in two (2) separate phases. The first phase to be implemented upon the Commission's approval of an Order in the upcoming rate case will result in a fifty percent (50%) reduction of the subsidy identified in the COSS based on the Commission-approved rates and the second phase will implement the remaining fifty percent (50%) reduction as illustrated in **Exhibit A**. The second phase will occur on the later of: (i) issuance of a Commission Order in Stucker Fork's next general rate case; or (ii) five (5) years from the date of an Order in Stucker Fork's upcoming rate case. Before making a Compliance Filing to implement rates, Stucker Fork will update the COSS to reflect the rates approved by the Commission and provide Morgan Foods three (3) business days to review the rates.
- 4. Support for COSS. Morgan Foods hereby consents to the implementation of the COSS consistent with the terms and conditions set forth herein. Morgan Foods agrees to support Stucker Fork's proposed COSS before the Commission. Such support may include, among other things, the prefiling of testimony and exhibits in opposition to any changes to the COSS proposed by any party not a signatory to this agreement that would impact the terms of this Agreement. Stucker Fork also agrees to support the phased in rate increase described above. It is understood that Morgan Foods may still challenge the revenue requirements, but Morgan Foods will not challenge the COSS methodology or raise an issue that the test year in this case is stale. All Parties retain all rights in future proceedings to take any position with respect to cost of service and rate design not inconsistent with this Agreement.
- 5. <u>Entire Agreement</u>. This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the Parties and supersedes all prior agreements, arrangements, and understandings relating to the subject matter hereof and does not affect the Parties' rights in this proceeding except as to the COSS and the test year matter set forth above.
- 6. <u>Counterparts</u>. This Agreement may be executed by one or more of the Parties hereto and all said counterparts taken together shall be deemed to constitute one and the same instrument.
- 7. <u>Modifications</u>. Neither this Agreement nor any term hereof may be changed, modified, altered, waived, discharged, or terminated, except by written instrument. Failure to insist upon strict adherence to any term of this Agreement shall not be considered a waiver or deprive that Party of the right thereafter to insist upon strict adherence to that term or any other term of this Agreement.
- 8. <u>Authority to Execute</u>. Each Party and signatory hereto has the authority to enter into this Agreement and at all times has full authority to perform this Agreement. No further approval or consent by any other person or authority is required.

- 9. <u>Successors and Assigns</u>. The Parties agree that this Agreement should be binding on the Parties' successors and assigns. However, Morgan Foods may not assign this Agreement without the express written consent of Stucker Fork.
- 10. <u>No Waiver</u>. No waiver of any provision of this Agreement shall be deemed to have been made unless expressed in writing and signed by the Party charged therewith. No delay or omission in the exercise of any right or remedy accruing upon the breach of this Agreement shall impair such right or remedy or be construed as a waiver of the breach. The waiver by Stucker Fork or Morgan Foods of any breach shall not be deemed a waiver of any other breach of the same or any other provision of this Agreement.
- 11. <u>Severability</u>. If any provision of this Agreement is found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be illegal, invalid, or unenforceable, the remaining terms hereof will not be affected, and in lieu of each provision that is found to be illegal, invalid, or unenforceable, a provision will be added as part of this Agreement that is as similar to the illegal, invalid, or unenforceable provision as may be possible and be legal, valid, and enforceable.
- 12. <u>Governing Law</u>. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed under the laws of the State of Indiana.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have executed this Agreement and all rights and responsibilities created by this Agreement shall be binding on their successors and assigns.

MORGAN FOODS, INC.
Printed: Steven Hankins
Title: CFO
STUCKER FORK CONSERVANCY DISTRICT:
By: Randy Nudle
Printed: RANDY Weedler
Title: 5upt.

# Exhibit A COSS