Sunset Public Hearing Questions for
UTILITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD
Created by Section 7-82-701, *Tennessee Code Annotated*
(Sunset termination June 2015)

1. Provide a brief introduction to the Utility Management Review Board, including information about its purpose, statutory duties, staff, and administrative attachment.

The Utility Management Review Board (UMRB) was created for the purpose of advising utility district boards of commissioners in the area of utility management. The 95th General Assembly created the UMRB in 1987. The Board promulgated its rules and regulations and began hearing cases in January 1989. Effective July 1, 1989, the UMRB was vested with authority over all utility districts established by any public or private acts. The term "utility district" includes agencies, authorities or instrumentalities of government created by public or private act having authority to administer a water or wastewater facility, other than those agencies, authorities or instrumentalities of government electing pursuant to TCA 68-221-1006(a) or TCA 68-221-1206(a) to come under the jurisdiction of the Water and Wastewater Financing Board (WWFB). TCA 7-82-702 defines the statutory duties of the UMRB to:

- **Adopt, modify, repeal and promulgate rules and regulations for the conduct of the affairs of the board;**
- **Give advisory technical assistance to any utility district upon request;**
- **Review any decision of any utility district, upon simple written request of any utility district customer or any member of the public within thirty (30) days after such decision;**
- **Upon failure of the board of commissioners of a utility district to adopt the rules and regulations or, upon the failure of a utility district to consider and resolve consumer complaints in accordance with such rules and regulations, establish an alternate mechanism for consideration and resolution of such complaints;**
- **From time to time, submit to the governor its suggestions for proposed amendments to this chapter;**
- **Issue subpoenas requiring attendance of witnesses and production of such evidence as requested; administer oaths, and take such testimony as the board deems necessary in fulfilling its purpose;**
- **To conduct a contested case hearing and issue an order of whether a member or members of the utility district board should be removed from office;**
- **To conduct a contested case hearing to determine if a utility district should be required to change its method of commissioner appointment to the uniform method;**
- **To promulgate rules as deemed necessary by the Board for training of utility district commissioners;**
- **To review a request of a citizen to be provided service by a utility district which adjoins his, if his refuses to provide service at a reasonable cost in a reasonable amount of time and the adjoining utility district agrees to provide the service;**
- **To review and approve the model of ethical standards prepared by the Tennessee Association of Utility Districts and to review other standards adopted by utilities to determine if they are more stringent; and,**

- **To evaluate the annual water loss percentage of utility districts and determine what is considered excessive.**

Public Acts 2007, Public Chapter 86, changed the administrative attachment of the UMRB from the Department of Environment and Conservation to the Comptroller of the Treasury. In October 2013, the Board was reassigned from the Division of Local Government Audit to the Office of State and Local Finance. Counsel for the Board also changed during that time period.

Staff to the UMRB consists of:

Jim Arnette, Director, Division of Local Government Audit
Sandi Thompson, Director, Office of State and Local Finance
Joyce Welborn, Utilities Board Manager
John Greer, Utilities Board Analyst
Rachel Newton, Assistant General Counsel
Betsy Knotts, Assistant General Counsel

2. Provide a list of current board members and describe how membership complies with Section 7-82-701, *Tennessee Code Annotated*, including who appointed each board member. Are there any vacancies on the board? If so, what is being done to fill those vacancies?

The UMRB has nine members, seven of which are appointed by the Governor. The remaining two members are the Comptroller of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Environment and Conservation or their designees. There are no vacancies on the UMRB at this time. The dates following the name of the member represent the newest members of the UMRB. As you can see, the majority of the members have been appointed since 2012.

Member	**Representing**
Ann Butterworth, Chair	**Comptroller of the Treasury designee**
Tom Moss	**Environment and Conservation designee**
Don Stafford	**Eastside Utility District Manager**
Pat Riley (2013)	**Gibson County Utility District Manager**
Bruce Giles (2014)	**First Utility District of Knox County Manager**
Jim Hunter (2013)	**West Wilson Utility District Commissioner**
Rebecca Hunter (2012)	**Hixson Utility District Commissioner**
Jason West (2012)	**Second South Cheatham Utility District Commissioner**
Loyal Featherstone	**Consumer**

3. How many times did the board meet during fiscal years 2013 and 2014, and how many members were present at each meeting?

The UMRB met four times in fiscal 2013 with eight members present at three meetings and seven members present at one meeting. The UMRB met four times in fiscal 2014 with eight members present at two meetings, seven members at one meeting, and six members at one meeting.

4. How does the board ensure that its members are operating in an impartial manner and there are no conflicts of interest? If there are formal conflict of interest policies, please attach them.

The Board has no formal conflict of interest policies. As provided for in the rules of the Board, members do not participate in discussions or votes relative to matters affecting the utility district they represent.

5. What per diem or travel reimbursement do members receive? How much was paid to board members during fiscal years 2013 and 2014?

The members are reimbursed travel expenses based on the State of Tennessee Comprehensive Travel Regulations, Board Member Reimbursement Rate Schedule. The Board members were reimbursed $3,057.38 in fiscal year 2013 and $2,424.33 in fiscal year 2014.

6. What were the board's revenues (by source) and expenditures (by object code) for fiscal years 2013 and 2014? Does the board carry a fund balance and, if so, what is the total of that fund balance? If expenditures exceeded revenues, and the board does not carry a fund balance, what was the source of the revenue for the excess expenditures?

There are no revenues directly attributed to the UMRB. Any expenditure relative to the UMRB is charged to the Comptroller of the Treasury, Office of State and Local Finance or the Division of Local Government Audit.

7. Is the board subject to Sunshine law requirements (Section 8-44-101 et seq., *Tennessee Code Annotated)* for public notice of meetings, prompt and full recording of minutes, and public access to minutes? If so, what procedure does the board have for informing the public of its meetings and making its minutes available to the public?

Yes, the UMRB is subject to the Sunshine Law. As required by the Open Records Act (TCA 10-7-503), any citizen of the State of Tennessee has access to the minutes of the UMRB meetings. The meeting dates of the UMRB are determined prior to the start of the calendar year and posted on the website of the UMRB. Once the agenda is set, the entire meeting packet is posted on the UMRB website. The meeting notices on the section of the Comptroller's website labeled Calendar and Public Notices are also linked to the UMRB website.

8. Describe the nature and extent of board activities and any major accomplishments during the last two fiscal years.

The UMRB continues to attempt to improve its functions and procedures. A major accomplishment is the adoption of the American Water Works Association (AWWA) water loss methodology which identifies financial indicators relative to excessive water loss.

9. What reports does the board prepare on its operations, activities, and accomplishments, and who receives those reports? Describe any reports required by statute, rule, or policy. Please attach copies of the most recent reports.

The staff prepares an annual report of the UMRB to be submitted to the Governor. Attached is a copy of the 2013 report.

10. Does the board have a web site? If so, please provide the web address. What kind of public information is provided on the site?

The website of the UMRB is: http://comptroller.tn.gov/UMRB/. The site contains overall information about the UMRB (responsibilities, characteristics, water loss information), meeting dates, the agenda of the upcoming (or most recent) UMRB meeting, a listing of members (who they represent and their term expiration date), the most recent annual report, procedure for filing a complaint, the model ethics policy, and contact information for the staff. The site also contains links for the Division of Local Government Audit, the Office of State and Local Finance and the Water and Wastewater Financing Board.

11. Has the board promulgated any rules as authorized by Section 7-82-702(1)? If rules have been promulgated, please cite the reference.

The rules of the UMRB are currently under review to effect changes for future operation. Current rules can be found at: http://tn.gov/sos/rules/1715/1715.htm

12. How are utility districts determined to be financially distressed?

A system is considered financially distressed if it has two consecutive years with a negative change in net position, a negative total net position or is in default on its outstanding debt as reflected in its annual audited financial statements. Districts are also referred to the Board for having excessive water loss based on performance indicators adopted by the Board.

13. How are distressed utility districts reported to the board? How many distressed utility districts have been reported to the board during the past three years?

The Comptroller of the Treasury, Office of Local Government Audit, receives the annual audited financial statements from the utility districts and refers them to the UMRB based on the criteria in Question # 12. There were 62 systems referred to the UMRB in 2011, 56 in 2012, and 62 in 2013. As of July 22, 2014, 14 systems had been referred.

14. How does the board address the problems of distressed utility districts? What are the most common actions taken by the board to address the problems of the distressed districts? How many financially distressed districts have been consolidated?

Staff prepares an analysis of the information received from the Division of Local Government Audit, schedules the UMRB appearance, contacts the utility and meets with the utility to discuss the situation. Staff will explain the operation and responsibilities of the UMRB and share the analysis it prepared. The utility system will develop a plan to solve the financially distressed condition with assistance of UMRB staff and other agencies as deemed necessary by the utility.

The most common action of the utility district is to increase its user rates. Sometimes a simple policy change will suffice. Fees and charges may be adjusted, as well. In the 25 year history of the UMRB, approximately 56 utility districts have consolidated with other systems. Not all of those districts have been financially distressed.

15. How does the board track the performance and financial progress of utility districts under its authority?

Staff to the UMRB annually reviews the audits as submitted to the Division of Local Government Audit to determine if the system has achieved compliance with the law. If so, a compliance report is submitted to the UMRB at its next meeting.

16. How many utility districts reported as distressed during the past three years have become financially stable as a result of the board's actions or guidance?

Through July 22, 2014, 58 systems have filed audits reflecting compliance since 2012.

17. What is the Utility District Revitalization Fund? What are the board's responsibilities and authority regarding the fund? Why is the fund needed? Has money been appropriated to the fund?

This fund was established in TCA 7-82-704 to assist a utility system by offsetting some of the negative impact created by consolidation of a financially distressed utility system with another utility system.

The fund was designed as a loan fund to assist utility systems with the immediate negative financial impact of absorbing a financially distressed system. The loan is to be repaid by the consolidated system according to a schedule agreed to under contact with the UMRB. If the repayment schedule is too burdensome or financially detrimental to the customers, the repayment may be waived – with the approval of the commissioner of finance and administration. Repayments of any loans will be returned to the fund.

There are currently cases under the jurisdiction of the UMRB that may benefit from such a fund; however, money has never been appropriated to the fund.

18. Which utility districts could currently benefit from the Utility District Revitalization Fund? What is the amount of indebtedness of the districts that could benefit from the fund?

Clay County Gas Utility District could benefit from the Utility District Revitalization Fund. The indebtedness is approximately $200,000 in principal, $50,000 in bond costs, and $540,000 in accrued interest. The district is in default, has an extremely small customer base, and is exploring possible consolidations or refunding of debt.

19. What are the policies and procedures (both formal and informal) for requesting a utility district rate review by the board? What documentation is required of a customer requesting a rate review?

A utility district simply has to ask staff of the UMRB for assistance with a rate review.
A customer of a district may file a rate review request by:
1) A petition signed by 10% of the customers of the District. The petition is filed directly with the UMRB. The UMRB is required to conduct a public hearing on the matter.
2) Within thirty days of the publication of the annual statement required by law in TCA 7-82-401, a customer may file a protest with the board of commissioners of the utility district. The decisions of the utility district may be appealed to the UMRB within thirty days of the action of the board of commissioners of the utility district

20. How many rate reviews have been requested during fiscal years 2013 and 2014? How many rate reviews has the board conducted? What were the board's decisions on the rate reviews?

Rate evaluations were prepared for each case presented to the UMRB as financially distressed. A rate review petition was filed by the Ratepayers of DeKalb Utility District when the District's management decided to construct a new water plant instead of purchasing water from the City of Smithville. That hearing was held in Smithville on April 4, 2013. The Board ruled in favor of the utility district stating that rates appeared to be sufficient.

21. What are the policies and procedures (formal and informal) for filing a complaint with the board concerning a utility district? What documentation is needed by a customer to have a complaint heard by the board?

If a customer has a complaint with a utility district, he must first appear before the board of commissioners of the utility district at a regularly scheduled meeting. If, at that meeting, the commissioners make a decision the customer wishes to appeal, the appeal must be made in writing to the UMRB. It is the responsibility of the UMRB to ensure that the District is following its own written policies and procedures. The customer must be very specific in what he is requesting. The staff will then contact the district requesting additional information in order to present the complaint to the UMRB. At times, the staff can solve the dispute between the district and the customer without a formal hearing before the UMRB. In many cases, it is a simple matter of explaining the situation to the customer.

22. How many customer complaints (formal written complaints and informal telephone complaints) have been filed with the board during the last three years? How many customer complaint cases has the board heard? What were the most common actions taken by the board in response to complaints?

During the calendar year 2012, there were 61 telephone and 26 written complaints received directly by staff. The Tennessee Regulatory Authority forwarded 47 complaints and 5 were received from various sources. During the calendar year 2013, there were 44 telephone complaints and 6 complaints from various sources received by staff. As of July 22, 2014, there have been 34 telephone and 8 other types of complaints received. The written complaints include both postal mail and e-mail.

The UMRB heard seven customer complaints in 2012, one in 2013 and two in 2014. All the complaints were decided in favor of the district. At each meeting, the UMRB is furnished with a list of complaints received by staff.

23. What is the Utility Relocation Loan Program? What is the Utility Management Review Board's responsibility and authority in the program? How are the loans applied for and how do the utility districts pay the loans back?

The primary purpose of this loan program for local governments is to provide loan financing related to the relocating, moving or re-installing of utility facilities when located within the rights-of-way of the highways. The relocation must be required because of highway construction projects administered by the Tennessee Department of Transportation. No additions or increased size may be included in the loan request.

The UMRB is the agency designated by the General Assembly to recommend these loans. The loan is typically repaid over five years (an interest free period), but may be repaid over a fifteen-year period.

Loans are applied for by submitting a letter from the local government, a letter from the Department of Transportation (TDOT) describing the project and requiring the local government to relocate its facilities, an engineering report (including estimated costs), an estimated time of construction, cash flow projections, evidence of inability to obtain other financing, and three years of audited financial statements. All the information is submitted to the UMRB and processed on a first-come, first-serve basis. Loans are repaid to TDOT.

24. How many loans have been made under the Utility Relocation Loan Program and what were the dollar amounts of each loan?

Eighteen loans totaling $9,325,924 have been made since the inception of the Utility Relocation Loan Program. They are:

Town of Bradford	**$ 72,115**
Town of Englewood	**$ 131,962**
Town of Estill Springs	**$ 485,000**
City of Etowah	**$ 900,000**
City of Fayetteville	**$3,294,557**
Town of Gleason	**$ 130,879**
Town of Graysville	**$ 35,952**
Town of Greenbrier	**$ 761,781**
City of Harriman	**$ 624,118**
City of New Johnsonville	**$ 308,295**
City of Pikeville	**$ 359,966**
City of Savannah	**$ 106,231**
Town of Whiteville	**$ 64,219**
Bedford County Utility District	**$ 600,000**
Evensville Utility District	**$ 815,000**
North Anderson Utility District	**$ 220,626**
Northeast Henry County Utility District	**$ 328,396**
Savannah Valley Utility District	**$ 86,827**

One loan is currently outstanding with a December 31, 2013 balance of $1,573,198. The available balance in the fund on December 31, 2013 was approximately $6,755,567.

25. Has the committee developed and implemented quantitative performance measures for ensuring it is meeting its goals? (Please answer either yes or no). If the committee has developed and implemented quantitative performance measures, answer questions twenty-six through thirty-three. If the committee has not developed quantitative performance measures, proceed directly to question thirty-four.

No, the UMRB has not developed quantitative performance measures. The caseload of the UMRB is reactive based on the number of referrals from the Division of Local Government Audit or the complaints (or other issues) received from utility district customers. Cases referred for financial distress or water loss are scheduled within thirty days of their receipt. Customer issues – depending on the type of issue – are handled as quickly as possible.

26. What are your key performance measures for ensuring this board is meeting its goals? Describe so that someone unfamiliar with the program can understand what you are trying to measure and why it is important to the operation of your program.

27. What aspect[s] of the program are you measuring?

28. Who collects relevant data and how is this data collected (e.g., what types information systems and/or software programs are used) and how often is the data collected? List the specific resources (e.g., report, other document, database, customer survey) of the raw data used for the performance measure.

29. How is the actual performance measure calculated? If a specific mathematical formula is used, provide it. If possible, provide the calculations and supporting documentation detailing your process for arriving at the actual performance measure.

30. Is the reported performance measure result a real number or an estimate? If an estimate, explain why it is necessary to use an estimate. If an estimate, is the performance measure result recalculated, revised, and formally reported once the data for an actual calculation is available?

31. Who reviews the performance measures and associated data/calculations? Describe any process to verify that the measure and calculations are appropriate and accurate.

32. Are there written procedures related to collecting the data or calculating and reviewing/verifying the performance measure? Provide copies of any procedures.

33. Describe any concerns about this board's performance measures and any changes or improvements you think need to be made in the process.

34. Describe any items related to the board that require legislative attention and your proposed legislative changes.

Staff is constantly striving to improve the operations of the UMRB. Legislative changes are currently being discussed, but not finalized.

35. Should this board be continued? Why or why not?

Yes, the UMRB should be continued. Since 1989, the UMRB has addressed 238 different entities relating to financial distress, relocation loans, complaints, petitions, and mergers. The UMRB provides the customers of utility districts assistance "at the state level" if they are unsatisfied with the responses from the utility district. Some of the utilities that were considered "beyond help" are now in compliance. Others have a plan in place to reach compliance or have been taken over by another utility.

36. Please list all board programs or activities that receive direct or indirect federal financial assistance and, therefore are required to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Include the amount of federal funding received by program/activity.

If the board <u>does</u> receive federal assistance, please answer questions 37 through 44. If the board <u>does not</u> receive federal assistance, proceed directly to question 43.

The UMRB receives no federal monies, nor does the Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury. The UMRB currently operates within the general administration budget of the Office of State and Local Finance within the Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury.

37. Does your board prepare a Title VI plan? If yes, please provide a copy of the most recent plan.

38. Does your board have a Title VI coordinator? If yes, please provide the Title VI coordinator's name and phone number and a brief description of his/her duties. If not, provide the name and phone number of the person responsible for dealing with Title VI issues.

39. To which state or federal agency (if any) does your board report concerning Title VI? Please describe the information your board submits to the state or federal government and/or provide a copy of the most recent report submitted.

40. Describe your board's actions to ensure that board staff and clients/program participants understand the requirements of Title VI.

41. Describe your board's actions to ensure it is meeting Title VI requirements. Specifically, describe any board monitoring or tracking activities related to Title VI, and how frequently these activities occur.

42. Please describe the board's procedures for handling Title VI complaints. Has your board received any Title VI-related complaints during the past year? If yes, please describe each complaint, how each complaint was investigated, and how each complaint was resolved (or, if not yet resolved, the complaint's current status).

43. Please provide a breakdown of current board staff by title, ethnicity, and gender.

The Director of Local Government Audit is a white male. The Director of the Office of State and Local Finance is a white female. The Utilities Board Manager is a white female. The Utilities Board Analyst is a white male. Both of the legal counsels are white females.

44. Please list all board contracts, detailing each contractor, the services provided, the amount of the contract, and the ethnicity of the contractor/business owner

The UMRB has no contracts nor does the Office of the Comptroller have any contacts on behalf of the UMRB.

STATE OF TENNESSEE
Utility Management Review Board
James K. Polk State Office Building, Suite 1500
505 Deaderick Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-1402
Phone (615) 401-7841 Fax (615) 741-6216

January 6, 2014

The Honorable Bill Haslam
Governor of Tennessee
First Floor, State Capitol
Nashville, TN 37243

Dear Governor Haslam:

The Utility Management Review Board is submitting to you its annual report for 2013.

On behalf of each member of the Board, I would like to extend our continued appreciation to the ladies and gentlemen of the Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury for their valuable contributions to the Board this year. Without their ongoing assistance, the Board would not be as successful.

The goal of the Board is to follow our legislative mandates and to extend our services to the citizens of the State of Tennessee. We appreciate your continued confidence in and support of the Board. If I, or any member of the Board, can be of further assistance to you and your staff, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Ann V Butterworth

Ann Butterworth
Chair

Attachment

Cc: Honorable Justin P. Wilson, Comptroller of the Treasury

ANNUAL REPORT
OF THE
UTILITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD

January 2013 through December 2013

ANNUAL REPORT FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2013

The 95th General Assembly created the Utility Management Review Board (Board) in 1987. The Board promulgated its rules and began hearing cases in January 1989. In 2007, the administrative support for the Board was transferred from the Department of Environment and Conservation to the Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury. The current rules of the Board became effective on September 27, 2010.

Approximately 174 utility districts operate in the State of Tennessee. Utility districts operate approximately 151 water, 19 wastewater, 24 natural gas and one fire protection systems.

The Division of Local Government Audit, Comptroller of the Treasury, refers utility districts to the Board in accordance with state statutes, either for financial distress or for water loss. Financially distressed utility districts are currently defined as those having deficit total net assets in any one year, having negative change in net assets for a period of two consecutive years, or currently being in default on any debt instrument. Utility districts with a validity score of 65 or less or non-revenue water as a percent by cost of operating system of 30% or greater are referred to the Board.

Staff to the Board reviews the referred utility districts and prepares presentations to the Board. Staff works with the utility districts to develop strategies to comply with state law. After the Board has approved a utility district's plan to achieve compliance, the Board monitors the case to determine if the approved recommended compliance plan is successful. If not, the District must meet with the Board and explain the steps required to resolve the condition.

During the 4 meetings held in 2013, 20 case studies (13 financial distress and 7 water loss), 14 status reports, and 24 compliance reports were presented to the Board.

Since its creation, 168 financially distressed utility districts have appeared before the Board. Currently there are 18 districts under the jurisdiction of the Board for financial distress. There are also 13 additional districts currently being monitored only for excessive water loss.

The Board has the authority to conduct a contested case hearing to determine if a utility district commissioner or commissioners should be removed from office based on petitions filed by 20% of the customers of a utility district. No petitions for removal of commissioners were filed in 2013.

The Board also has the authority to commence commissioner removal procedures based on the information presented in an investigative audit prepared by the Department of Audit. During 2013, two investigative reports were reviewed and removal proceedings were initiated for one group of commissioners. Removal proceedings which began in 2011 against commissioners of one utility district is currently in appeals court. The process will continue into 2014. The Board voted during 2013 not to pursue two cases for removal which had been pending since 2011.

The Board has the authority to review the rates charged by a utility district if a petition is filed by 10% of the customers within the authorized area of the district. In a petition filed during 2012, a hearing held in April 2013 reviewed the rates being charged by the District and determined that the rates were not proven to be excessive. The plantiffs have filed an appeal, which is currently in Chancery Court. There are two additional rate review cases that were remanded back from the Chancery Court for further review by the Board. One case was withdrawn by the complainant, while the other is still awaiting an order from the Chancery Court.

In 1989, the General Assembly created the Utility Relocation Loan Program (URLP). This legislation was enacted to assist cities and utility districts that require financial assistance to relocate utility lines due to highway construction by the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT). The Board was designated as the agency to recommend loans to the State Funding Board. There was one loan request submitted to the Board during 2013. That request was denied by the Board because the District had paid the expenses from its available cash. Currently there is one outstanding URLP loan with a balance of $1,573,198. The amount available in the URLP on December 31, 2013 was approximately $6,755,567. Those funds are held in the Highway Fund under TDOT for accounting purposes.

In 2007 the General Assembly authorized a utility district or water, wastewater or gas authority to adopt its own ethics policy instead of being subject to the relevant county's policy. If a district or authority chooses to adopt the Tennessee Association of Utility Districts (TAUD) model of ethical standards, no additional review is needed. The Board was required to review and approve the TAUD model before the model could be adopted by any utility district or water, wastewater or gas authority. If a district or authority chooses not to adopt the TAUD model, it must adopt a policy which must be determined to be more stringent by the Board. There were no requests to review ethics policies in 2013.

During the 2009 legislative session, the General Assembly revised the statutes to mandate Board approval of the creation of any new utility districts. There was one petition for creation reviewed and approved during 2013.

During the 2010 legislative session, the General Assembly created a utility district training requirement with the approved curriculum being filed with the Board. Four training curricula were filed with the Board during 2013.

CASES PRESENTED
TO THE
UTILITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD
DURING 2013

Utility District	County
Case Studies – Financial distress	
Arthur Shawanee Utility District	Claiborne
Bean Station Utility District	Grainger
Bon de Croft Utility District	White
Carderview Utility District	Johnson
Cold Springs Utility District	Johnson
First Utility District of Tipton County	Tipton
Haywood County Utility District	Haywood
Lone Oak Utility District	Sequatchie
Natural Gas Utility District of Hawkins County	Hawkins
Northwest Henry Utility District	Henry
Sneedville Utility District	Hancock
Sylvia-Tennessee City-Pond Utility District	Dickson
Tansi Sewer Utility District	Cumberland
Case Studies – Water loss	
Cherokee Hills Utility District	Polk
Clearfork Utility District	Campbell/Claiborne
Mooresburg Utility District	Hawkins
Roan Mountain Utility District	Carter
Samburg Utility District	Obion
Tarpley Shop Utility District	Giles
West Point Utility District	Lawrence
Status Report	
Bedford County Utility District	Bedford
Bloomingdale Utility District	Sullivan
Chuckey Utility District	Greene
Clay Gas Utility District	Clay
Cross Anchor Utility District	Greene
DeWhite Utility District	White
Double Spring Utility District	Putnam
Iron City Utility District	Lawrence
Lone Oak Utility District	Sequatchie
Minor Hill Utility District	Giles
Northeast Henry County Utility District	Henry
Quebeck Walling Utility District	White
Shady Grove Utility District	Jefferson
West Point Utility District	Lawrence

Compliance Reports

Arthur Shawanne Utility District	Claiborne
Bon de Croft Utility District	White
Bristol-Bluff City Utility District	Sullivan
Cedar Grove Utility District	Carroll
Claiborne County Utility District	Claiborne
Clarksburg Utility District	Carroll
Cold Springs Utility District	Johnson
Cookeville Boat Dock Road Utility District	Putnam
DeWhite Utility District	White
Double Springs Utility District	Putnam
Fall River Road Utility District	Lawrence
First Utility District of Hardin County	Hardin
Gibson County Municipal Water District	Gibson
Harbor Utility District	Benton
Jackson County Utility District	Jackson
Leoma Utility District	Lawrence
Quebeck-Walling Utility District	White
Siam Utility District	Carter
South Elizabethton Utility District	Carter
South Giles Utility District	Giles
South Side Utility District	Putnam
Tuckaleechee Utility District	Blount
West Point Utility District	Lawrence
Woodlawn Utility District	Montgomery

Petitions

Ratepayers of DeKalb Utility District vs. DeKalb Utility District	DeKalb

Complaints

Bent Creek Golf Village vs. Webb Creek Utility District	Sevier
City of Elkton vs. South Giles Utility District	Giles
Goddard vs. West Knox Utility District	Knox
Outdoor Resorts of America vs. Webb Creek Utility District	Sevier
Pheiffer vs. South Giles Utility District	Giles

Investigative Reports

Northeast Henry County Utility District	Henry
Sneedville Utility District	Hancock

Utility Relocation Loan requests

Cookeville Boat Dock Road Utility District	Putnam

Creation Petition

West Stewart Utility District	Stewart

Complaints received by staff	**63**
Directly:	
By telephone	44
By e-mail	4
By mail or Governor's office	2
By fax or Comptroller web	2
From Tennessee Regulatory Authority	11

UTILITY DISTRICTS
CURRENTLY UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE
UTILITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD

Bean Station Utility District	Grainger
Bedford County Utility District	Bedford
Bloomingdale Utility District	Sullivan
Carderview Utility District	Sullivan
Cherokee Hills Utility District	Polk
Chuckey Utility District	Greene
Clay Gas Utility District	Clay
Clearfork Utility District	Campbell/Claiborne
Cross Anchor Utility District	Greene
East Sevier Utility District	Sevier
Hampton Utility District	Carter
Haywood County Utility District	Haywood
Intermont Utility District	Sullivan
Iron City Utility District	Lawrence
Lone Oak Utility District	Sequatchie
Minor Hill Utility District	Giles
Mooresburg Utility District	Hawkins
Natural Gas of Hawkins County	Hawkins
Northeast Henry County Utility District	Henry
Northwest Utility District	Hamilton
Northwest Henry Utility District	Henry
Roan Mountain Utility District	Carter
Samburg Utility District	Obion
Shady Grove Utility District	Jefferson
Sneedville Utility District	Hancock
Sylvia-Tennessee City-Pond Utility District	Dickson
Tansi Sewer Utility District	Cumberland
Tarpley Shop Utility District	Giles
Unicoi Water Utilit District	Unicoi
Webb Creek Utility District	Sevier
West Cumberland Utility District	Cumberland

MEMBERS
OF THE
UTILITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD

Ms. Ann Butterworth, Chair
Comptroller of the Treasury designee

Mr. S. Donnie Leggett — Replaced April 30, 2013
Hardeman-Fayette Utility District, General Manager
Hardeman County

Mr. Tom Moss
Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation Commissioner designee

Mr. Don Stafford
Eastside Utility District, General Manager
Hamilton County

Mr. Loyal Featherstone
Consumer member
Shelby County

Mr. Troy Roach
New Market Utility District, General Manager
Jefferson County

Mr. Charlie Anderson — Replaced November 13, 2013
Bloomingdale Utility District
Sullivan County

Mr. Jason West
Second South Cheatham Utility District
Cheatham County

Ms. Rebecca R. Hunter
Hixson Utility District
Hamilton County

Mr. Pat Riley — Appointed May 1, 2013
Gibson County Utility District Manager
Gibson County

Mr. Jim Hunter — Appointed November 14, 2013
West Wilson County Utility District Commissioner
Wilson County

COMPTROLLER OF THE TREASURY
STAFF TO THE
UTILITY MANAGEMENT REVIEW BOARD

Ms. Joyce Welborn
Utilities Board Manager

Ms. Rachel Newton
Assistant General Counsel