

1 proposed usage per Residential customer is significantly understated. Table GRM-7  
2 shows the historic usage per Residential customer by year, dating back to 2018.

| <u>Line</u> | <u>Year</u>                    | <u>Usage</u><br><u>(000 Gal)</u>  | <u>Avg.</u><br><u>Customers</u> | <u>Usage/</u><br><u>Customer</u><br><u>(000 Gal)</u> |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1           | 2018 <sup>1</sup>              | <del>5,648,780</del><br>5,645,780 | 119,360                         | <del>47.33</del><br>47.30                            |
| 2           | 2019 <sup>1</sup>              | 5,931,753                         | 120,704                         | 49.14  |
| 3           | 2020 <sup>1</sup>              | 6,072,579                         | 122,008                         | 49.77  |
| 4           | 2021 <sup>1</sup>              | 5,874,579                         | 123,090                         | 47.73  |
| 5           | 2022 <sup>1</sup>              | 5,987,176                         | 124,036                         | 48.27  |
| 6           | Company Test Year <sup>2</sup> | 5,748,449                         | 126,014                         | 45.62  |

Sources:  
<sup>1</sup> KAWC Exhibit 37, Schedule I-4.  
<sup>2</sup> KAWC Exhibit 37, Schedule M-3. Avg. Customers calculated by dividing the sum of Customer Meter Billings ÷ 12.

3 As Table GRM-7 above shows, the estimated usage per customer proposed by  
4 KAWC is 45.62, which is significantly lower than the historical Residential average.  
5 The Company’s proposed estimated usage per customer of 45.62 is at its lowest level  
6 dating back to 2018. Yet, the proposed Residential consumption (5,748,449 thousands  
7 of gallons, hereafter “MGal”) suggested by KAWC has been exceeded every year from  
8 2019 onwards. KAWC is essentially arguing that Residential customers are using less  
9 water per customer than they have over the past four years. Clearly, the usage per

- 1           ➤ Safety Improvement;
- 2           ➤ Customer Service Improvement; and
- 3           ➤ Operational Efficiencies.

4                   However, the CBA does not ~~quantify those cost savings or~~ propose how those  
5           cost savings will be reflected in customers' rates.

6   **Q.    Is the reflection of cost savings important?**

7    A.    Yes, if there is no mechanism to reflect those cost savings in customer rates, those cost  
8           savings will benefit only KAWC's shareholders. The CBA lists the cost savings to be  
9           achieved by the AMI meter replacement program. If those cost savings are reflected in  
10          the CBA, but not used to reduce customers' rates, then cost savings are of no value to  
11          customers. For example, assume cost savings for 2024 from AMI investments were  
12          projected to be \$10,000. If there is not a process to capture those savings, the \$10,000  
13          cost savings in 2024 would not be transferred to ratepayers through rate changes.

14   **Q.    What is your concern regarding stranded investment from the AMI meter**  
15          **replacement program?**

16   A.    I am concerned that KAWC may not have fully considered the potential for stranded  
17          investment costs resulting from the retirement of the current generation of meters.  
18          When asked whether the stranded costs were taken into consideration in any CBA, the  
19          response indicated that the remaining net book value of the current assets would be  
20          recovered over the remaining lives of the assets.<sup>44</sup> To the extent that this is not the case

---

<sup>44</sup>See KAWC's Response to OAG Data Request, 1-40.