#### State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations



#### **DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL**

150 South Main Street • Providence, RI 02903 (401) 274-4400 TDD (401) 453-0410

Patrick C. Lynch, Attorney General

#### Via First Class Mail and Electronic Transmission

September 15, 2005

Ms. Luly Massaro Commission Clerk Public Utilities Commission 89 Jefferson Blvd. Warwick, RI 02888

Re: City of Newport, Utilities Department, Water Division

Docket No. 3675

Dear Ms. Massaro:

Enclosed for filing in the above-captioned proceeding, on behalf of the Division of Public Utilities and Carriers, please find an original and nine (9) copies of the Direct Testimony of Thomas S. Catlin.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Leo J. Wold

Special Assistant Attorney General

Encl.

cc: Service List

#### **BEFORE THE**

#### **PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

#### OF RHODE ISLAND

CITY OF NEWPORT	)	
UTILITIES DEPARTMENT,	)	DOCKET NO. 3675
WATER DIVISION	)	

**DIRECT TESTIMONY** 

OF

**THOMAS S. CATLIN** 

# ON BEHALF OF THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES AND CARRIERS

**SEPTEMBER 2005** 

## **EXETER**

ASSOCIATES, INC. 5565 Sterrett Place Suite 310 Columbia, Maryland 20904

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE
Introduction1
Customer Charge Revenue 5
Employee Vacancies
Accumulated Benefits Buyout
Retiree Insurance Expense
City Legal and Administrative Services
Data Processing Services
Sewer Billing Service Revenue
Cash Flow Difficulties
Rate Design21

#### BEFORE THE

#### PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

#### OF RHODE ISLAND

CITY OF NEWPORT	)	
UTILITIES DEPARTMENT,	)	DOCKET NO. 3675
WATER DIVISION	)	

#### Direct Testimony of Thomas S. Catlin

1		<u>Introduction</u>
2	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?
3	A.	My name is Thomas S. Catlin. I am a principal with Exeter Associates, Inc. Our offices
4		are located at 5565 Sterrett Place, Suite 310, Columbia, Maryland 21044. Exeter is a
5		firm of consulting economists specializing in issues pertaining to public utilities.
6	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.
7	A.	I hold a Master of Science Degree in Water Resources Engineering and Management
8		from Arizona State University (1976). Major areas of study for this degree included
9		pricing policy, economics, and management. I received my Bachelor of Science Degree
10		in Physics and Math from the State University of New York at Stony Brook in 1974. I
11		have also completed graduate courses in financial and management accounting.
12	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL
13		EXPERIENCE?
14	A.	From August 1976 until June 1977, I was employed by Arthur Beard Engineers in
15		Phoenix, Arizona, where, among other responsibilities, I conducted economic feasibility,
16		financial and implementation analyses in conjunction with utility construction projects. I
17		also served as project engineer for two utility valuation studies.

From June 1977 until September 1981, I was employed by Camp Dresser &
McKee, Inc. Prior to transferring to the Management Consulting Division of CDM in
April 1978, I was involved in both project administration and design. My project
administration responsibilities included budget preparation and labor and cost monitoring
and forecasting. As a member of CDM's Management Consulting Division, I performed
cost of service, rate, and financial studies on approximately 15 municipal and private
water, wastewater and storm drainage utilities. These projects included: determining
total costs of service; developing capital asset and depreciation bases; preparing cost
allocation studies; evaluating alternative rate structures and designing rates; preparing bill
analyses; developing cost and revenue projections; and preparing rate filings and expert
testimony.

In September 1981, I accepted a position as a utility rates analyst with Exeter Associates, Inc. I became a principal and vice-president of the firm in 1984. Since joining Exeter, I have continued to be involved in the analysis of the operations of public utilities, with particular emphasis on utility rate regulation. I have been extensively involved in the review and analysis of utility rate fillings, as well as other types of proceedings before state and federal regulatory authorities. My work in utility rate fillings has focused on revenue requirements issues, but has also addressed service cost and rate design matters. I have also been involved in analyzing affiliate relations, alternative regulatory mechanisms, and regulatory restructuring issues. This experience has involved electric, natural gas transmission and distribution, and telephone utilities, as well as water and wastewater companies.

Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED IN REGULATORY PROCEEDINGS ON UTILITY RATES?

1	Α.	res. Thave previously presented testimony on more than 200 occasions before the
2		Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the public utility commissions of Arizona,
3		California, Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Idaho, Illinois,
4		Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio,
5		Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia and West Virginia, as well as before this
6		Commission. I have also filed rate case evidence by affidavit with the Connecticut
7		Department of Public Utility Control.
8	Q.	ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU APPEARING?
9	A.	I am presenting testimony on behalf of the Division of Public Utilities and Carriers (the
10		Division).
11	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED ON WATER UTILITY ISSUES
12		BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?
13	A.	Yes, I have been asked by the Division to address water utility issues on several
14		occasions. I testified on revenue requirement, cost of service and/or rate design issues in
15		Newport Water Division, Docket Nos. 2029, 2985, 3457 and 3578; Providence Water
16		<u>Supply Board</u> , Docket Nos. 2022, 2048, 2304, 2961, and 3163 and 3446; <u>Kent County</u>
17		Water Authority, Docket No. 2098, Woonsocket Water Department, Docket Nos. 2099
18		and 2904; United Water Rhode Island, Inc., (formerly Wakefield Water Company),
19		Docket Nos. 2006 and 2873; and Pawtucket Water Supply Board, Docket Nos. 3193,
20		3378, 3497 and 3674.
21	Q.	ARE YOU A MEMBER OF ANY PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES?
22	A.	Yes. I am a member of the American Water Works Association (AWWA) and the
23		Chesapeake Section of the AWWA. I serve on the AWWA's Rates and Charges

1		Committee and on the AWWA Water Utility Council's Technical Advisory Group on
2		Economics.
3	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
4	A.	Exeter Associates was retained by the Division to assist it in the evaluation of the rate
5		filing submitted by the City of Newport Utilities Department, Water Division (Newport
6		Water or the Water Division) on April 19, 2005. This testimony presents my findings
7		and recommendations with regard to the overall revenue increase to which Newport is
8		entitled. In addition, my testimony also addresses cost allocation and rate design issues.
9	Q.	HAVE YOU PREPARED SCHEDULES TO ACCOMPANY YOUR
10		TESTIMONY?
11	A.	Yes. I have prepared Schedules TSC-1 through TSC-10. Schedule TSC-1 provides a
12		summary of revenues and expenses under present and proposed rates. Schedules TSC-2
13		through TSC-9 present my adjustments to Newport Water's claimed revenues, operating
14		expenses and debt service costs and other supporting information. Schedule TSC-10
15		presents the development of the rates necessary to generate the Division's recommended
16		revenues.
17	Q.	WHAT TIME PERIODS HAVE YOU UTILIZED IN MAKING YOUR
18		DETERMINATION OF NEWPORT'S REVENUE REQUIREMENTS?
19	A.	Consistent with Newport Water's filing, I have utilized a test year ended June 30, 2004
20		and a rate year ending June 30, 2006 as the basis for determining the Water Division's
21		revenue requirements and the revenue increase necessary to recover those requirements.
22	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION WITH REGARD TO THE
23		APPROPRIATE INCREASE IN REVENUES IN THIS PROCEEDING?

1	A.	As shown on Schedule 15C-1, it is my recommendation that Newport Water receive a
2		revenue increase of \$1,111,498 in this proceeding. This amount is \$185,689 less than the
3		increase of \$1,297,187 that the Water Division requested in its initial Application to
4		Change Rates. My recommendation is \$615,423 less than the revenue deficiency of
5		\$1,726,921 identified in the Supplemental Testimony of Harold J. Smith. As explained
6		by Mr. Smith in that testimony, the increase in the revenue deficiency was due to
7		correcting an error in the test year water sales and, in turn, projected rate year water sales
8		and revenue. The effect of that error was partially offset by a reduction in Newport
9		Water's claim for bad debt expense from \$225,000 to \$30,000.
10	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION WITH REGARD TO HOW THE
11		ADDITIONAL REVENUES SHOULD BE RECOVERED?
12	A.	I have accepted Newport Water's proposal to recover the allowed increase through a
13		uniform percentage increase in existing rates and charges for metered water services and
14		fire protection services.
15		
16		Customer Charge Revenue
17	Q.	WHAT ADJUSTMENT ARE YOU PROPOSING TO MAKE TO CUSTOMER
18		CHARGE REVENUES AT EXISTING RATES?
19	A.	In July of 2004, Newport Water began billing all customers with one-inch and larger
20		meters on a monthly basis. Previously, some of those customers had been billed three
21		times per year. In addition, Newport Water also switched to a new billing system which
22		more accurately identifies intermittent accounts. As a result of these changes, the number
23		of bills in fiscal year (FY) 2005 increased to 49,801 compared to 48,510 in FY 2004.

1		In its filing, Newport Water based the number of bills subject to a customer
2		charge on a five year average for the period FY 2000 through FY 2004. This resulted in
3		an average of 49,171 bills. In order to recognize the billing changes that have taken
4		place, I am proposing to base rate year customer charge revenues on the actual number of
5		bills in FY 2005. As shown on Schedule TSC-3, this results in an increase in revenue of
6		\$6,930 at the current charge of \$11.00 per bill.
7	Q.	DO YOU HAVE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS WITH REGARD TO
8		THE FREQUENCY OF BILLING?
9	A.	Yes. Currently, Newport Water's tariffs state that the customer billing charge shall be
10		rendered in advance either monthly or tri-annually, concurrent with the billing cycle. The
11		tariff for metered sales states that metered sales shall be billed in arrears either monthly
12		or tri-annually, at the option of Newport Water Division. In order to avoid confusion, I
13		would recommend that Newport Water's tariffs be modified to state that metered water
14		customers with one-inch and larger meters will be billed monthly and customers with
15		5/8-inch and 3/4 –inch meters will be billed tri-annually. Any changes to billing
16		frequency would then require an approved tariff change.
17		
18		Employee Vacancies
19	Q.	WHAT ASSUMPTION HAS NEWPORT WATER MADE WITH REGARD TO
20		EMPLOYEE VACANCIES IN THE RATE YEAR?
21	A.	In developing its claimed rate year cost of service, Newport Water has included salaries
22		and wages for its full complement of employees for the entire year. That is, Newport
23		Water has assumed that there will be no vacant positions during the rate year.
24	Q.	IS THIS ASSUMPTION REASONABLE?

1	A.	No. Employee vacancies will occur over the course of the rate year (or any other year)
2		due to normal employee turnover. In fact, as of the beginning of the rate year on July 1,
3		2005 Newport Water had three employee vacancies, not including the new Deputy
4		Utilities Director-Finance position. Based on recent experience, Newport Water has
5		averaged approximately two vacant positions.
6	Q.	WHAT ADJUSTMENT ARE YOU PROPOSING TO MAKE TO THE RATE
7		YEAR COST OF SERVICE TO REFLECT EMPLOYEE VACANCIES?
8	A.	I am proposing to adjust rate year salaries and wages and employee insurance costs to
9		reflect an average of two vacant positions. I have developed my adjustment based on the
10		average salary level and average insurance cost per employee for the rate year. As shown
11		on Schedule TSC-4, this adjustment reduces the rate year cost of service by \$117,594.
12		
13		Accumulated Benefits Buyout
14	_	PLEASE SUMMARIZE NEWPORT WATER'S CLAIM FOR
	Q.	1 = 2 10 2 0 0 M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M M
15	Q.	ACCUMULATED BENEFITS BUYOUT COSTS.
	Q.	
15		ACCUMULATED BENEFITS BUYOUT COSTS.
15 16		ACCUMULATED BENEFITS BUYOUT COSTS.  Newport Water has requested an allowance of \$70,000 for accumulated benefits buyout
15 16 17		ACCUMULATED BENEFITS BUYOUT COSTS.  Newport Water has requested an allowance of \$70,000 for accumulated benefits buyout (ABB) expense. ABB costs represent the amount owed for unused vacation and sick
15 16 17 18		ACCUMULATED BENEFITS BUYOUT COSTS.  Newport Water has requested an allowance of \$70,000 for accumulated benefits buyout (ABB) expense. ABB costs represent the amount owed for unused vacation and sick leave when an eligible employee retires from the Water Division. Newport Water has
15 16 17 18 19		ACCUMULATED BENEFITS BUYOUT COSTS.  Newport Water has requested an allowance of \$70,000 for accumulated benefits buyout (ABB) expense. ABB costs represent the amount owed for unused vacation and sick leave when an eligible employee retires from the Water Division. Newport Water has based its claim on a maximum benefits buyout cost of \$35,000 per retirement for two
15 16 17 18 19 20		ACCUMULATED BENEFITS BUYOUT COSTS.  Newport Water has requested an allowance of \$70,000 for accumulated benefits buyout (ABB) expense. ABB costs represent the amount owed for unused vacation and sick leave when an eligible employee retires from the Water Division. Newport Water has based its claim on a maximum benefits buyout cost of \$35,000 per retirement for two employees. Newport Water indicates it has three employees eligible for retirement

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Eligibility is based on having 30 years of service with the City or having 58 years of age with 10 years of service. Military service is considered under certain conditions.

I am recommending that Newport Water's request to fund ABB costs be accepted with two modifications. First, I am recommending that a restricted account be established to account for ABB costs. Because an employee becomes eligible to retire and receive an ABB does not mean that the eligible employee will retire at that time. Hence, the timing of the payout for accumulated benefits is not known and may not occur in the rate year. Establishing a restricted account will allow the funds to be set aside and actual expenditures tracked. To the extent that actual payouts are more or less than established in this proceeding, the funding allowance can be adjusted in future cases.

My second recommended change to Newport Water's request is to adjust the amount of funding allowed in rates in this proceeding. For the three employees currently eligible to retire, the total buyout obligation is \$75,992 or \$25,331 per employee. This amount could change by the time these employees retire. However, it is clear that the actual buyout cost will be less than \$35,000 each. Therefore, rather than basing the rate allowance on the maximum exposure per employee, I am proposing to base the allowance for ABB costs on the average cost per employee based on the existing exposure for the three currently eligible employees and the two employees who retired in FY 2004. This results in an average allowance per employee of \$27,000 and an annual funding allowance of \$54,000. As shown on Schedule TSC-5, this results in a reduction in rate year expense of \$16,000.

A.

#### **Retiree Insurance Expense**

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE NEWPORT WATER'S CLAIM WITH REGARD TO RETIREE INSURANCE EXPENSE

1	A.	Newport Water has increased the cost incurred in the test year to provide medical and
2		dental insurance to retirees to reflect the projected rate year levels of such costs. In doing
3		so, Newport Water has both recognized increases in the premiums for existing retirees
4		and included \$13,150 per employee (\$26,300 total) for two potential new retirees,
5		consistent with its claim for ABB costs. In total, Newport Water's filing includes
6		\$198,661 for retiree insurance costs.
7	Q.	WHAT CONCERNS DO YOU HAVE WITH REGARD TO NEWPORT
8		WATER'S CLAIM FOR RETIREE INSURANCE COVERAGE?
9	A.	I believe Newport Water's proposal to include the costs for two additional retirees
10		overstates rate year costs for several reasons.
11	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE BASES FOR YOUR CONCERN.
12	A.	First, as discussed previously with regard to ABB costs, it is not known whether either of
13		the eligible employees will retire in the rate year and, if so, when. As a result, it is not
14		known whether any additional costs will be incurred for new retirees in the rate year.
15		Second, even if both eligible employees did retire in the rate year, the cost of medical and
16		dental insurance for those employees is already included as part of employee insurance
17		expense. Accordingly, Newport Water would not incur any additional expense until
18		replacement employees are hired and began to receive medical and dental insurance.
19		Third, there is a six-month waiting period before new employees become eligible for
20		medical and dental insurance. Therefore, the maximum amount which Newport Water
21		would incur in the rate year is twelve months of additional premiums if both employees
22		retired and were replaced immediately.
23	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE?

A.	I am proposing to revise Newport Water's claim for retiree insurance expense to exclude
	the \$26,300 for potential new retirees. Instead, I am proposing to include an allowance of
	\$13,000 to establish a restricted account to fund incremental retiree insurance costs. At
	such time as an existing employee retires and a replacement employee becomes eligible
	for insurance coverage, any incremental costs that Newport Water incurs to pay the
	additional premiums for the replacement employee would be funded out of this account
	until those additional premiums are reflected in rates

Q. COULD YOU PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF HOW THIS WOULD ACCOUNT
 WOULD FUNCTION?

Yes. Let's assume that both of the eligible employees retire in the first day of the rate year and that the two-replacement employees are both hired 3 months later. Also assume that the health insurance premiums for each retiring employee are \$13,000 per year and the annual premiums for one replacement employee are \$7,400 and, for the other are \$13,000. The premiums for the retiring employees are already included in rates. Therefore, Newport Water would begin to incur incremental premiums of \$1,700 per month (\$7,400 plus \$13,000 per year divided by twelve) for the last three months of the rate year (when the six-month waiting period is over). At the end of the rate year, the balance in the fund would be the \$13,000 funding amount less \$5,100 in incremental premiums, or \$7,900. This balance would be carried over until the next year and used to help fund the \$1,700 per month of incremental premiums until rates are reset. Ultimately the account will be reconciled and the annual contribution can be adjusted in each rate case.

A.

1	Q.	ARE YOU PROPOSING ANY OTHER ADJUSTMENTS TO NEWPORT
2		WATER'S CLAIMED ALLOWANCE FOR RETIREE INSURANCE
3		EXPENSE?
4	A.	Yes. Newport Water provided a corrected calculation of the rate year cost for retiree
5		insurance costs in response to Div. 1-8. That response identifies the rate year cost for
6		existing retirees to be \$183,326, with a total rate year cost of \$209,626 when the
7		additional \$26,300 for two potential existing retirees is added. This represents an
8		increase of \$10,965 for existing retirees which I have included in my analysis pending
9		verification of the actual premiums for FY 2006.
10	Q.	HAVE YOU PREPARED A SCHEDULE THAT SHOWS THE EFFECT OF
11		YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE RATE YEAR COST OF SERVICE?
12	A.	Yes. Schedule TSC-6 summarizes the changes that I am proposing to Newport Water's
13		claim for retiree insurance premiums. As indicated there, the net effect of my
14		adjustments is to reduce the rate year cost of service by \$2,335.
15		
16		City Legal and Administrative Services
17	Q.	WHAT CLAIM HAS NEWPORT WATER MADE FOR LEGAL AND
18		ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE CITY OF NEWPORT?
19	A.	Newport Water has requested a rate year allowance of \$510,408 to be paid to the City of
20		Newport for legal and administrative services. This represents an increase of \$397,708
21		compared to the test year allowance for these costs. Coupled with the increase of
22		\$208,563 in the amount which Newport Water is proposing to pay the City for data
23		processing services (discussed subsequently), the total requested increase in payments for
24		services is \$606,271. When the associated operating reserve requirement is included, this

1		accounts for nearly one-half (47.4 percent) of the rate increase proposed in Newport
2		Water's initial filing and over one-third (36.8 percent) of the revenue deficiency reflected
3		in Mr. Smith's supplemental testimony.
4	Q.	HOW WAS NEWPORT WATER'S REQUESTED ALLOWANCE FOR CITY
5		LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DETERMINED?
6	A.	The claimed allowance for legal and administrative services includes costs associated
7		with twelve City departments. Of this total, the costs of nine departments are allocated
8		based on the Water Division's percentage of the total budget excluding the City's
9		contribution to the Schools and the Library. These departments, which account for
10		\$446,764 of the total \$510,408 of proposed charges, include:
11		City Council
12		• City Manager
13		• City Solicitor
14		• City Clerk
15		• Finance Administration
16		• Assessment
17		• Collections
18		Administrative Services
19		• Facilities Maintenance
20		The additional three departments, Human Resources, Accounting and Purchasing,
21		are allocated to Newport Water based on payroll checks, vendor checks and purchase
22		orders, respectively. The costs of these three departments total \$63,644.

1	Q.	DO YOU AGREE WITH THE INCREASED AMOUNT OF COSTS
2		ALLOCATED TO NEWPORT WATER FOR CITY ADMINISTRATIVE AND
3		LEGAL SERVICES?
4	A.	No. I recognize that the existing payment for City services has been in place for some
5		years and some increase may be reasonable. However, the proposed allocation of
6		administrative and legal costs in this proceeding is not appropriate and should be
7		adjusted.
8	Q.	WHAT ADJUSTMENTS ARE YOU PROPOSING TO MAKE TO THE
9		CLAIMED ALLOWANCE FOR CITY ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL
10		SERVICES?
11	A.	I am proposing to make several adjustments to amount of costs for several of the City
12		departments whose costs were allocated to Newport Water based on percent of budget. I
13		have also adjusted the Water Division's percentage of the budget to reflect Newport
14		Water's filed cost of service. I am not proposing to make any changes to the amount of
15		costs for those departments that were allocated to the Water Division based on objective
16		measures of the services provided (Human Resources, Accounting and Purchasing).
17	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ADJUSTMENTS THAT YOU ARE PROPOSING TO
18		THE ALLOCATION OF THE COSTS OF THOSE CITY DEPARTMENTS
19		THAT ARE BASED ON PERCENT OF BUDGET.
20	A.	The first adjustment I have made is to the budgeted City Council costs allocated to
21		Newport Water. The City Council budget includes \$30,000 for the Sister City program
22		and \$20,962 for public celebrations. I have excluded both of these cost claims because
23		they are similar to charitable contributions and image building advertising costs and are
24		not properly recovered through rates.

My second adjustment relates to the costs of the City Solicitor's office allocated
to Newport Water. Including the total of the City Solicitor's office as subject to
allocation to the Water Department is not appropriate because it fails to recognize that the
Water Department engages its own outside counsel. Moreover, one of the two assistant
City Solicitors represents the City as a prosecutor on law enforcement matters and, thus,
is not involved in matters involving Newport Water. Accordingly, I have included only
one-half of the costs of the City Solicitor's office as subject to allocation to Newport
Water.

Third, I have made an adjustment to the costs of the City Clerk's office eligible for allocation to Newport Water. In its filing, the costs included under the City Clerk allocation include budgets for both the City Clerk and the Land Evidence division within the Department of Public Records. The Land Evidence division is "responsible for recording deeds, mortgages, leases, condominium declarations, quitclaim deeds, certified copies of documenting and other similar instruments." (Response to Div. 3-4.) These are not services utilized by Newport Water. Therefore, I have excluded the budgeted costs for the Land Evidence division from the costs allocable to Newport Water. I have accepted the costs of the actual City Clerk's office as allocable to the Water Division.

Fourth, I have limited the costs of the Finance Administration department allocable to the Water Division to one-half of the total budget. Newport Water has requested approval for a Deputy Utilities Director – Finance position to allow it to strengthen its own internal financial management and take more responsibility for its own finances. (I have accepted that request and have included the cost of that new position in my recommended cost of service.) Therefore, it is appropriate to recognize that this new Deputy Director will reduce the reliance on the City and will distinguish the Water

Division from other City departments. At the same time, it is also appropriate to recognize that Newport Water will continue to rely on the City for financial management assistance. Accordingly, I am proposing to include one-half of the Financial Administrative costs in the allocation of City services costs to Newport Water.

The fifth adjustment I have made to the City legal and administrative costs that are allocated to Newport Water is to eliminate the costs of the Assessment Division within the Department of Finance. This division is responsible for the distribution of the total tax burden using acceptable evaluation methods as well as for processing and approving tax exemptions. (Response to Div. 3-4.) These are not services performed on behalf of the Water Division or for the benefit of the Water Division. Therefore, I have removed the costs of the Assessment Division from those included in the allocation of City legal and administrative costs to Newport Water.

The sixth and final adjustment I have made to the costs of those City departments that are allocated based on percent of budget relates to the Facilities Maintenance costs allocated to the Water Division. The Facilities Maintenance (or Property Management/Maintenance) division is responsible for maintaining the cleanliness and structural integrity of the public facilities within the City. In Newport Water's filing, approximately \$95,000 out of the total \$602,000 budget for this division has been allocated to the Water Division. This amount is excessive, especially considering that the response to Div. 1-17 states that 25 percent of one custodian's time is allocated to the Water Division, along with supervision. Therefore, I have reduced the Facilities Maintenance budget subject to allocation to Newport Water by \$400,000 to \$202,116. This results in an allocation to the Water Division for custodial and related services of approximately \$30,000.

1	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT CHANGES YOU HAVE MADE TO THE WATER
2		DIVISION'S BUDGET USED TO CALCULATE ITS PERCENTAGE SHARE
3		OF THE TOTAL CITY BUDGET.
4	A.	The budget utilized in Newport Water's filing to calculate the Water Division's
5		percentage share of the total City budget was \$10,832,300. This compares to a filed cost
6		of service of \$9,801,199 in the original filing and \$9,603,274 in the supplemental filing.
7		Newport Water has indicated that its filed claim is based on its FY 2005-2006 budget.
8		Therefore, I have revised Newport Water's share of the total City budget to reflect its
9		filed claim in this case. To be conservative, I have elected not to reduce the filed claim to
10		reflect my adjustments to Newport Water's claimed cost of service.
11	Q.	WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF YOUR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AMOUNT
12		ALLOCATED TO NEWPORT WATER FOR CITY LEGAL AND
13		ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES?
14	A.	As shown on Schedule TSC-7, the adjustments that I have made to the costs subject to
15		allocation to the Water Division result in a reduction of \$1,267,551. Adjusting Newport
16		Water's percentage share of the total City budget used to allocate costs reduces that
17		percentage from 15.69 percent to 14.16 percent. The combined effect of these
18		adjustments is to reduce the amount allocated to Newport Water for City legal and
19		administrative services from the \$510,408 claimed by Newport Water to \$287,365. This
20		represents a reduction of \$223,043 to Newport Water's filed claim. However, my
21		recommendation still represents an increase of \$174,665 compared to the previously
22		approved allowance of \$112,700 for City legal and administrative services.
23		

1		<b>Data Processing Services</b>
2	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE NEWPORT WATER'S CLAIM RELATED TO DATA
3		PROCESSING SERVICES FROM THE CITY OF NEWPORT.
4	A.	Newport Water has included \$289,663 in the rate year cost of service for the costs of data
5		processing services from the City of Newport. This amount was calculated by
6		multiplying the FY 2006 budget for the Management Information Systems division
7		(MIS) by Newport Water's share of the City's total FY 2006 budget excluding the
8		Schools and the Library. This claimed rate year expense represents an increase of
9		\$208,563 over the previously authorized allowance of \$81,100 for data processing
10		services booked in the test year.
11	Q.	DO YOU AGREE WITH THE CLAIMED ALLOWANCE FOR DATA
12		PROCESSING SERVICES FROM THE CITY OF NEWPORT?
13	A.	No. The proposal to calculate Newport Water's data processing costs by allocating the
14		total MIS budget based on its share of the total City budget is inappropriate for two
15		reasons. First, this procedure resulted in 15.69 percent of the total MIS budget being
16		allocated to Newport Water. This is inconsistent with the fact that amount of time spent
17		by MIS personnel on Water Division issues has ranged from only 4.5 to 10.7 percent of
18		their time each month. (Response to Div. 1-19.) Second, excluding the schools entirely
19		from the allocation of MIS division costs ignores the fact that the school system utilizes
20		the City's general ledger, payroll and human resources systems.
21	Q.	WHAT ADJUSTMENTS ARE YOU PROPOSING TO MAKE TO THE COST
22		OF CITY DATA PROCESSING SERVICES ASSIGNED TO THE WATER
23		DIVISION?

I am proposing to revise the allocation factor utilized to determine Newport Water's share of the MIS division's costs to reflect two changes. First, I have revised the Water Division budget to reflect its filed cost of service as discussed previously with regard to the allocation of City legal and administrative costs. Second, I have adjusted the total City budget to include the amount included in the FY 2006 General Fund budget as the transfer to the schools in order to recognize that the City provides MIS support to the schools. However, by only including the General Fund portion of the Schools budget, not the entire Schools budget, I have also recognized that the Schools also have some independent MIS systems. The effect of these two changes is to reduce the percentage of MIS division costs allocated to Newport Water from 15.69 percent to 10.57 percent. As shown on Schedule TSC-8, this reduces the total MIS costs allocated to Newport Water from \$289,663 claimed by Newport Water to \$195,138, a reduction of \$94,525. As with City's legal and administrative costs, this still represents a significant increase (\$110,038) over the previously authorized allowance for data processing services.

A.

#### **Sewer Billing Service Revenue**

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT REVENUE NEWPORT WATER HAS INCLUDED FOR THE PROVISION OF BILLING SERVICE TO THE NEWPORT WATER POLLUTION CONTROL DIVISION.

A. Newport Water has included \$10,560 of miscellaneous revenue from the Newport Water Pollution Control Division (the WPCD) for the provision of sewer billings in the rate year. This amount was calculated based on an equal sharing of the contract billing costs and postage associated with sending combined water and sewer bills to customers in the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Per the response to Div. 3-5, the General Fund Transfer to the Schools is \$23,041,396.

1		City of Newport. Prior to FY 2006, Newport Water has not charged the WPCD for any
2		of the costs of billing.
3	Q.	DO YOU AGREE WITH NEWPORT WATER'S DETERMINATION OF THE
4		CHARGE TO THE WPCD FOR SEWER BILLING?
5	A.	No. Newport Water includes the bills for sewer service to customers in the City of
6		Newport on its bill for water services. The rates for sewer service in Newport consist of
7		both a monthly customer charge and volumetric charges, like the rates for water service.
8		Accordingly, those billings rely on same meter readings and other customer accounting
9		services necessary to bill for water service. Therefore, charging only for a share of the
10		costs of the outside contract billing services and postage understates the costs which are
11		reasonably billed to the WPCD for the billing of sewer service.
12	Q.	HOW ARE YOU PROPOSING TO DETERMINE THE CHARGES TO THE
13		WPCD FOR PROVIDING THE BILLS FOR SEWER SERVICE?
14	A.	I am proposing that the charge to the WPCD be based on a pro rata share of the operation
15		and maintenance expenses for the Customer Accounts function of the Water Division.
16		The derivation of my adjustment is presented on Schedule TSC-9. As shown there, I
17		have allocated 33.21 percent of Customer Accounts O&M costs to sewer billing services.
18		This is based on an equal sharing of the costs attributable to the 66.4 percent of Water
19		Division customers that are also billed for sewer service. As shown on Schedule TSC-9,
20		this results in \$158,750 of costs billable to the WPCD, an increase of \$148,190 compared
21		to the amount recognized in Newport Water's filing. In developing my adjustment, I
22		have assumed that one of the employee vacancies which I am proposing to recognize
23		occurs in the Customer Accounts function. This has the effect of reducing the costs
24		allocable to the WPCD for sewer billing services.

1	Q.	COULD A LARGER CHARGE FOR SEWER BILLING SERVICES BE
2		JUSTIFIED?
3	A.	Yes. As noted previously, I have assumed that one of the two employee vacancies for
4		which I have made an adjustment will always exist in the Customer Accounts function.
5		This has the same effect as assuming one employee is not billable to the WPCD. Second
6		I have not included any capital outlays or debt service associated with water meters or
7		other aspects of customer accounting. Finally, I have not included any administrative
8		costs or other overhead charges in developing the amount billable to the WPCD.
9	Q.	IS REQUIRING THE WPCD TO BEAR A PROPORTIONATE SHARE OF
10		THE COSTS OF THE CUSTOMER ACCOUNTING FUNCTION
11		APPROPRIATE?
12	A.	Yes. Requiring the WPCD to pay for a pro rata share of the costs associated with
13		providing joint billing is no different than requiring Newport Water to pay an allocated
14		share of the costs associated with legal, administrative and data processing services
15		provided by the City of Newport. Moreover, sharing the billing function between the
16		Water Division and the WPCD results in lower costs than each division performing its
17		own billing. It is, therefore, appropriate to share the costs and the savings. There is no
18		reason why the WPCD should effectively realize all of the benefits while Newport Water
19		bears all of the costs.
20		
21		Cash Flow Difficulties
22	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE NEWPORT WATER'S REQUEST WITH REGARD
23		TO ADDRESSING ITS CASH FLOW DIFFICULTIES.

1	A.	In FY 2005, Newport Water experienced cash flow difficulties in its debt service
2		restricted account which necessitated the temporary transfer of funds from another
3		restricted account to make its debt service payment in November 2004. In his testimony,
4		Mr. Smith notes that Newport Water expects to experience a cash deficiency in the debt
5		service restricted account again in November 2005. This problem arises because the
6		amounts deposited to the restricted account in July through November are not sufficient
7		to cover the November debt service payment even though the annual amount deposited to
8		the debt service account is adequate to cover Newport Water's annual debt service
9		payments. To address this problem, Newport Water has requested that it be allowed to
10		combine its separate debt service and capital spending restricted accounts into a single
11		account.
12	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR POSITION WITH REGARD TO THIS PROPOSAL?
13	A.	I would recommend that Newport Water be allowed to combine the cash balances in its
14		debt service and capital spending restricted accounts into a single account. However, I
15		would also recommend that Newport Water continued to be required to separately track
16		the amounts of funding and expenditures for debt service and capital outlays. This would
17		alleviate the cash flow problems associated with funding the November debt service
18		payment. At the same time it would ensure that the amounts included in rates for debt
19		service and capital outlays are utilized for those purposes.
20		
21		Rate Design
22	Q.	HAVE YOU DEVELOPED RATES TO RECOVER THE REVENUE
23		INCREASE THAT YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED AS NECESSARY?

I	Α.	Yes. As noted previously, I am proposing that the allowed rate increase be recovered
2		through a uniform percentage increase in the rates for water service and fire service. As
3		shown on page 1 of Schedule TSC-10, the revenue increase of \$1,111,498 which I have
4		recommended on behalf of the Division represents an increase of 14.58 percent with the
5		rate year revenue from existing water and fire service rates. Page 2 of Schedule TSC-10
6		presents the calculation of the rates necessary to generate this increase and provides a
7		proof of revenue at proposed rates.
8	Q.	DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?
9	A.	Yes, it does.
10		

12 W:\3226\tsc\direct\direct.doc

#### **BEFORE THE**

# PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF RHODE ISLAND

CITY OF NEWPORT	)	
UTILITIES DEPARTMENT,	)	DOCKET NO. 3675
WATER DIVISION	Ś	

# SCHEDULES ACCOMPANYING THE DIRECT TESTIMONY

**OF** 

THOMAS S. CATLIN

# ON BEHALF OF THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES AND CARRIERS

**SEPTEMBER 2005** 

### **EXETER**

ASSOCIATES, INC. 5565 Sterrett Place Suite 310 Columbia, Maryland 20904

Summary of Revenues and Expenses at Present and Proposed Rates Rate Year Ended June 30, 2006

	Rate Year Amount Per Newport	Ac	Division Adjustments	Rate Year at Present Rates	Proposed Rate Increase	Rate Year at Proposed Rates
Revenue Customer Charge Retail Consumption Wholesale/Bulk Sales	\$ 540,877 5,553,219 736,392	↔	6,934	\$ 547,811 5,553,219 736,392	\$ 79,682 809,249 107,483	\$ 627,493 6,362,468 843,876
Fire Protection Miscellaneous Total Revenue	786,805 259,060 \$ 7,876,353	<del>\S</del>	148,190 155,124	786,805 407,250 \$ 8,031,477	115,044	901,849 407,250 \$ 9,142,935
<b>Expenses</b> Water Administration	2,032,168		(394,700)	1,637,468	1	1,637,468
Customer Accounts Source of Supply-Island	536,815 455,087		(58,797)	478,018 455,087	1 1	478,018 455,087
Source of Supply-Mainland	95,663			95,663	t	95,663
Treatment & Pumping-Newport Plant Treatment & Pumping-Lawton Valley	1,352,566 1,026,354			1,352,566 1,026,354		1,352,566 1,026,354
Water Laboratory	213,952			213,952	•	213,952
Transmission & Distribution Maintenance Fire Protection	838,893 14,000			838,893 14,000		838,893 14,000
Subtotal	\$ 6,565,498	↔	(453,497)	\$ 6,112,001	- ↔	\$ 6,112,001
Payment to City General Fund Debt Service Capital Outlays	250,000 1,378,768 1,267,088			250,000 1,378,768 1,267,088	1 1 1	250,000 1,378,768 1,267,088
Total Expenses	\$ 9,461,354	↔	(453,497)	\$ 9,007,857	ı <del>⇔</del>	\$ 9,007,857
Operating Reserve	141,920		(6,802)	135,118	1	135,118
Total Cost of Service	\$ 9,603,274	↔	(460,299)	\$ 9,142,975	۱ <del>ده</del>	\$ 9,142,975
Revenue Surplus/(Deficiency)	(\$1,726,921)		\$615,423	(\$1,111,498)	\$ 1,111,458	(\$41)

#### Summary of Division Adjustments to Rate Year Revenues and Expenses at Present Rates Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

Description	Amount	Source
Customer Billing Charge Miscellaneous Charges	6,934 148,190	Schedule TSC-3 Schedule TSC-9
Total Revenue Adjustments	155,124	
Employee Vacancies	(117,594)	Schedule TSC-4
Accumulated Benefits Buyout	(16,000)	Schedule TSC-5
Retiree Insurance Costs	(2,335)	Schedule TSC-6
City Legal & Administrative Services	(223,043)	Schedule TSC-7
City Data Processing Services	(94,525)	Schedule TSC-8
Operating Reserve	(6,802)	See Note (1)
Total Expense Adjustments	\$ (460,299)	
Total Adjustment to Revenue Deficiency	(615,423)	

<sup>(1)</sup> Based on 1.5% of total expenses as reflected on Schedule TSC-1.

#### Adjustment to Customer Charge Revenue at Existing Rates Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

Number or Bills in FY 2005 (1)	49,801
Current Customer Charge Per Bill	 11.00
Increase	\$ 547,811
Customer Charge Revenue per Newport Water (2)	 540,877
Increase in Customer Charge Revenue	\$ 6,934

- (1) Per update to Div. 2-4.
- (2) Per Schedule RFC-5.

Adjustment to Wages and Benefits To Reflect Employee Turnover Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

	_A	djustment
Compensation Per Employee (1) Average Salary and Wages Average Employee Insurance	\$	40,674 18,123
Total Compensation per Employee	\$	58,797
Average Employee Vacancies (2)	***************************************	2
Total Adjustment to Wages and Benefits	\$	(117,594)

- (1) Based on total rate year amounts per Schedule RFC 2 less amounts for Administrative personnel divided by 43 employees.
- (2) Based on response to informal request.

#### Adjustment to Accrued Benefits Buyout Expense Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

	*****	Total
Average Accrued Benefits Buyout Obligation per Employee (1)	\$	27,000
Average Annual Employee Retirements		2
Annual Expense Allowance per Division (1)	\$	54,000
Annual Expense per Filing (2)	\$	70,000
Adjustment to Expense	\$	(16,000)

- (1) Based on average for 3 eligible employees per response to Div. 1-6 and amounts for 2 recent employees per Direct Testimony of Julia Forgue at page 10.
- (2) Per Schedule RFC C.

#### Adjustment to Retiree Insurance Expense Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

		Amount
Rate Year Insurance Costs for Existing Retirees Updated Estimate (1)	\$	183.326
As Filed Amount (2)	•	172,361
Adjustment for Existing Retirees	\$	10,965
Allowance for New Retirees		
Division Allowance to Fund Reserve Account		13,000
As Filed allowance (1)		26,300
Total Adjustments	\$	(13,300)
Adjustment to Rate Year Expense	\$	(2,335)

- (1) Per response to Div. 1-8.
- (2) Reflects filed request of \$198,661 less \$26,300 allowance of new retirees.

#### Adjustment to City Legal and Administrative Services Expense Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

		Allocable FY 2006 Budget Division Per Newport (1) Exclusions (2)			FY	Allocable 2006 Budget er Division
City Council City Manager City Solicitor City Clerk Finance Administration Assessment Collections Administrative Services Facilities Maintenance	\$ #	130,230 296,918 360,705 458,964 329,332 270,906 263,286 134,628 602,116	\$	(50,962) - (180,353) (200,664) (164,666) (270,906) - (400,000)	\$	79,268 296,918 180,353 258,300 164,666 - 263,286 134,628 202,116
Balance Subject to Allocation		2,847,085	\$	(1,267,551)	\$	1,579,535
Newport Water Budget Total City Budget (3) Allocation Factor	\$	10,832,300 69,030,823 15.692%	\$	(1,229,026) (1,229,026)	\$	9,603,274 67,801,797 14.164%
Newport Water Allocation	\$	446,764			\$	223,721
Human Resources Accounting Purchasing		13,440 36,785 13,419		- - -		13,440 36,785 13,419
Total Legal & Administrative Services		510,408			\$	287,365
Division Adjustment					\$	(223,043)

- (1) Per Schedule RFC C.
- (2) Refer to Testimony of Thomas S. Catlin for explanation of adjustments.
- (3) Per Schedule RFC C. Excludes Schools and Library general fund amounts.

#### Adjustment to City Data Processing Services Expense Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

	Allocable FY 2006 Budget Per Newport (1)		FY 2006 Budget Division			Allocable 2006 Budget er Division
Management Information Systems	_\$_	1,845,933	\$	-		1,845,933
Newport Water Budget Total City Budget Allocation Factor	\$	10,832,300 69,030,823 15.692%		(1,229,026) 21,812,370		9,603,274 90,843,193 10.571%
Newport Water Allocation	\$	289,663			\$	195,138
Division Adjustment					\$	(94,525)

- (1) Per Schedule RFC C.
- (2) Refer to Testimony of Thomas S. Catlin for explanation of adjustments.

#### Adjustment to Sewer Billing Service Revenue Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

	 Total
Customer Accounts O&M Costs (1)	\$ 478,018
Percent Allocable to Sewer Billings (2)	 33.21%
Costs Billable to Water Pollution Control Division	\$ 158,750
Amount per Newport Water (2)	 10,560
Adjustment to Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ 148,190

- (1) Per Schedule TSC-1. Amount assumes 1 vacancy in Customer Accounts division.
- (2) Per response to Div. 2-1.

#### Calculation of Uniform Percentage Increase in Rates Required to Generate Additional Revenues Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

Customer Class	Existing		Rate Year Sales (1) (1,000 gals)	R	Rate Year evenues at isting Rates
Retail Navy Portsmouth	\$	3.38 2.0873	1,384,515 418,511	\$	4,679,661 873,558
Metered Sales Revenues at Existing Rates		1.658	444,145	 \$	736,392
Type of Charge		Existing Charge	Number Billed (2)	R	6,289,611  Rate Year evenues at isting Rates
Billing Charge (2)	\$	11.00	49,801	******	547,811
Fire Protection Charges (Public)	\$	560.00	982		549,920
Fire Protection Charges (Private) less than 2" 2" 4" 6" 8" 10" 12" Total Private Fire Service	\$	11.00 46.00 285.00 570.00 1,305.00 2,155.00 3,460.00	- - 55 234 62 - 2	\$	15,675 133,380 80,910 - 6,920 236,885
Total Rate Year Revenues	from	Existing Ra	tes and Charges	\$	7,624,227
Net Rate	e Yea	r Revenue F	Requirements (3)	_\$_	8,735,726
		Additional F	Revenue Needed	\$	1,111,498
	% Revenue Increase Required				14.58%

- (1) Per Schedule RFC 5 Supplemental, except number of bills.
- (2) Per Schedule TSC-4.
- (3) Per Schedule TSC-1.

#### Calculation of Proposed Rates and Proof of Revenue at Proposed Rates Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

Customer Class	E	Existing Rate	Percent Increase (1)		oposed Rate	Rate Year Sales (2) (1,000 gals)	Re	Rate Year evenues at posed Rates
Retail	\$	3.38	14.58%	\$	3.873	1,384,515	\$	5,362,227
Navy	•	2.0873	14.58%	\$	2.39	418,511	•	1,000,241
Portsmouth		1.658	14.58%	\$	1.90	444,145		843,876
Metered Sales Revenues at Proposed Rates							\$	7,206,343
							F	Rate Year
		xisting			xisting	Number	Re	evenues at
Type of Charge		Charge		_	Charge	Billed	Prop	osed Rates
Billing Charge (3)	\$	11.00	14.58%	\$	12.60	49,801		627,493
Fire Protection Charges (Public)	\$	560.00	14.58%	\$	642.00	982		630,444
Fire Protection Charges (Private)								
less than 2"	\$	11.00	14.58%	\$	13.00	_		_
2"	•	46.00	14.58%	*	53.00	_		_
4"		285.00	14.58%		327.00	55		17,985
6"		570.00	14.58%		653.00	234		152,802
8"		1,305.00	14.58%		495.00	62		92,690
10"		2,155.00	14.58%		469.00	-		-
12"		3,460.00	14.58%		964.00	2		7,928
Total Private Fire Service					•		\$	271,405
	Total I	Rate Year	Revenues from	Prop	osed Rate	es and Charges	\$	8,735,685
			Net Rate Ye	ar R	evenue Re	equirements (4)	_\$_	8,735,726
						Difference	\$	(41)

- (1) Per page 1 of this schedule.
- (2) Per Schedule RFC 5 Supplemental, except number of bills.
- (3) Per Schedule TSC-4.
- (4) Per Schedule TSC-1.

#### Calculation of Proposed Rates and Proof of Revenue at Proposed Rates Rate Year Ending June 30, 2006

\$	Existing Rate  3.38 2.0873 1.658	Percent Increase (1) 14.58% 14.58%	Pr	7 coposed Rate 3.873 2.39 1.90	Rate Year Sales (2) (1,000 gals) 1,384,515 418,511 444,145	Re	Rate Year evenues at posed Rates 5,362,227 1,000,241 843,876
						\$	7,206,343
					Number Billed	Re	Rate Year evenues at posed Rates
\$	11.00	14.58%	\$	12.60	49,801		627,493
\$	560.00	14.58%	\$	642.00	982		630,444
;	2,155.00 3,460.00		1, 2, 3, Prop	653.00 495.00 469.00 964.00 osed Rate	equirements (4)	\$ \$	17,985 152,802 92,690 - 7,928 271,405 8,735,685 8,735,726
	\$ \$ \$	\$ 3.38 2.0873 1.658  Existing Charge  \$ 11.00 \$ 560.00  \$ 11.00 46.00 285.00 570.00 1,305.00 2,155.00 3,460.00	Rate         Increase (1)           \$ 3.38         14.58%           2.0873         14.58%           1.658         14.58%           Existing Charge         11.00           \$ 11.00         14.58%           46.00         14.58%           285.00         14.58%           570.00         14.58%           1,305.00         14.58%           2,155.00         14.58%           3,460.00         14.58%	Rate         Increase (1)           \$ 3.38 14.58% \$ 2.0873 14.58% \$ 1.658 14.58% \$ 1.658 14.58% \$            \$ 11.00 14.58% \$ \$ 560.00 14.58% \$ \$ 46.00 14.58% \$ 46.00 14.58% \$ 285.00 14.58% 570.00 14.58% 1,305.00 14.58% 1,305.00 14.58% 2,3460.00 14.58% 3,460.00 14.5	Rate         Increase (1)         Rate           \$ 3.38 14.58% \$ 3.873         \$ 3.873 14.58% \$ 2.39           \$ 1.658 14.58% \$ 1.90         \$ 1.90           Existing Charge         Existing Charge           \$ 11.00 14.58% \$ 12.60         \$ 642.00           \$ 11.00 14.58% \$ 13.00 46.00 14.58% \$ 53.00 285.00 14.58% 327.00 570.00 14.58% 653.00 1,305.00 14.58% 653.00 1,305.00 14.58% 1,495.00 2,155.00 14.58% 2,469.00 3,460.00 14.58% 3,964.00           Total Rate Year Revenues from Proposed Rate	Existing Rate         Percent Increase (1)         Proposed Rate         Sales (2) (1,000 gals)           \$ 3.38 14.58% \$ 3.873 1,384,515         2.0873 14.58% \$ 2.39 418,511           1.658 14.58% \$ 1.90 444,145           Existing Charge         Existing Charge         Number Billed           \$ 11.00 14.58% \$ 12.60 49,801         \$ 560.00 982           \$ 11.00 14.58% \$ 13.00 46.00 14.58% 53.00 570.00 14.58% 327.00 55         570.00 14.58% 653.00 234           1,305.00 14.58% 1,495.00 62         2,155.00 14.58% 2,469.00 -	Existing Rate         Percent Increase (1)         Proposed Rate         Sales (2) (1,000 gals)         Reserve Proposed (1,000 gals)         Proposed (1,000 gals)         Reserve Proposed (1,000 gals)         Proposed (1,000 gals)         Reserve Proposed (1,000 gals)         Proposed (1,000 gals)         Reserve Proposed (1,000 gals)         Reserve Proposed (1,000 gals)         Proposed (1,000 gals)         Reserve (1,000 gals) <t< td=""></t<>

- (1) Per page 1 of this schedule.
- (2) Per Schedule RFC 5 Supplemental, except number of bills.
- (3) Per Schedule TSC-4.
- (4) Per Schedule TSC-1.