KEOUGH & SWEENEY, LTD.

ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW
41 MENDON AVENUE
PAWTUCKET, RHODE ISLAND 02861
TELEPHONE (401) 724-3600
FACSIMILE (401) 724-9909
www.keoughsweeney.com

JOSEPH A. KEOUGH JR.* JEROME V. SWEENEY III*

> SEAN P. KEOUGH* STACI L. KOLB

JEROME V. SWEENEY II OF COUNSEL

*ADMITTED TO PRACTICE IN RHODE ISLAND & MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON OFFICE: 171 MILK STREET SUITE 30 BOSTON, MA 02109 TEL. (617) 574-0054 FAX (617) 451-1914

June 5, 2015

Ms. Luly Massaro, Clerk Division of Public Utilities and Carriers 89 Jefferson Boulevard Warwick, RI 02888

Re: Pawtucket Water Supply Board, General Rate Filing Docket No. 4550

Dear Ms. Massaro:

RAYNHAM OFFICE:

90 NEW STATE HIGHWAY

RAYNHAM, MA 02109 TEL. (508) 822-2813

FAX (508) 822-2832

Enclosed please find an original and nine (9) copies of the following:

1. The Pawtucket Water Supply Board Response to Cumberland's Data Requests (Set 3).

Please note that an electronic copy of this document has been provided to the service list.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Joupe all ph Ja

Joseph A. Keough Jr.

JAK/kf Enclosures

cc: Karen Lyons, Esquire

Cumb. 3-1:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-1 and Sch. DGB-2] The FY2014 audited statement (page 10) shows a "Change in net position" of \$3,619,718. Sch. DGB-2 (page 4 of 4) shows a "Net Income/(Loss)" of \$3,619,716 for FY2014. Do these two amounts, except for a \$2 rounding difference, indicate the same level of Total Revenues in excess of Total Expenses for the PWSB system in FY2014? If negative, please explain in detail what each amount represents. Does either or both of these amounts indicate that the approved rates in FY2014 provided more than sufficient revenues to cover (pay for) all system costs in FY2014. If negative, please explain in detail why this is not the case.

Response:

Except for the \$2 rounding difference, the schedule and the audited financial statement do reflect Total Revenues in excess of Total Expenses for the PWSB system in FY2014. Regarding whether this excess as presented on the audited financial statement and DGB-2 indicate that the approved rates in FY2014 provided more than sufficient revenues to cover (pay for) all system costs in FY2014, the answer is no. These totals reflect the GAAP basis financial balances and do not reflect the regulatory basis upon which the PWSB rates are calculated. Since the PWSB is a municipal and not investor owned utility, several regulatory adjustments have to be made to the GAAP basis financial such as removing depreciation, adding principal paid on debt and adding the expenditures for capital additions. The regulatory basis financial balances are reflected on DGB-1.

In addition, the PWSB's rate filing documents demonstrate why the current revenues are not sufficient. Please refer to Woodcock Schedule 11.0 for a summary of this documentation.

Prepared by: D. Bebyn and C. Woodcock

Cumb. 3-2:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-5 and DGB-6] Please provide all assumptions, calculations and supporting documents used to derive the "One time DOT Revenue" adjustment in FY2012. To the extent this total adjustment can be separated into its component parts due to having been received on different dates and/or for different services/goods, provide these separable amounts and explain in detail why each component should not be included in misc. revenues in FY2012.

Response:

The "one time DOT revenue" results from the settlement of a RIDOT claim of \$371,529 against the PWSB, which was an accrued liability and relates to a Roosevelt Avenue construction project during the years 1991 through 1993. PWSB disputed the RIDOT claim. This claim was finally settled during FY2012 for a final payment of \$115,000. Therefore, the remaining accrued liability balance of \$256,529 was reclassified to miscellaneous income in FY2012.

Set 3

Cumb. 3-3:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-7 and Schedule Cumb 1-7] With respect to just the O&M Reserve Fund, what was the required funding level at the end of FY2014? Please provide all assumptions, calculations and supporting documents used to derive that amount. Again, with respect to just the O&M Reserve Fund, if the funds maintained in that Fund exceed the required levels at the end of a fiscal year, can the amount in excess of the required amounts be used for other purposes? If negative, please explain why with reference(s) to the specific requirements and the associated documents. Would your response to the last question be any different if the excess amount in this Fund was significantly greater (by say 3 or 4 times) than the required amount? If affirmative, explain in detail why.

Response:

Whether the PWSB can use funds that exceed the required level at the end of a fiscal year for other purposes, depends on the source of the excess funds. For instance, the current balance in the O&M Reserve Fund is \$2,708,185, which exceeds the required level by \$400,983. Of this amount, \$338,776 is attributable to interest income and, in accordance with Section 512 of the Indenture, must be retained in the O & M Reserve, and cannot be used for other purposes. However, as set forth in the PWSB's original filing, the excess funds attributable to interest income will offset the need to recover money in rates to fund this reserve in the future because as the PWSB's O&M Costs increase so too does the amount required to fund this reserve

Upon advice of Bond Counsel, and to ensure compliance with the Trust Indenture, the PWSB will withdraw the remaining excess amount of \$68,207 from this account, as these funds should not have been deposited into this account. However, the PWSB has to deposit this amount into the IFR account pursuant to the terms of Section 504(2)(ix) of the Trust Indenture.

Prepared by:

Robert Benson with information from bond counsel, Karen S.D. Grande, Esquire

Cumb. 3-4:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-7 and Schedule Cumb 1-7] With respect to just the Infrastructure Replacement (IFR) Account, what was the required funding level at the end of FY2014? Please provide all assumptions, calculations and supporting documents used to derive that amount. Again, with respect to just the IFR Account, if the funds maintained in that Fund exceed the required levels at the end of a fiscal, can the amount in excess of the required amounts be used for other purposes? If negative, please explain why with reference(s) to the specific requirements and the associated documents. Would your response to the last question be any different if the excess amount in this Account was significantly greater (by say 3 or 4 times) than the required amount? If affirmative, explain in detail why.

Response:

The PUC's order in the PWSB's most recent docket (4171) authorized the PWSB to fund its restricted IFR account with an amount not to exceed \$2,500,000. However, the PWSB is not required to "whole dollar fund" this account, which means the PWSB does not deposit 1/12th of the \$2,500,000 into the restricted IFR account. Thus, there is no "required" funding level.

Set 3

Cumb. 3-5:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-8 and Schedule DGB-1] Are there capital costs in PWSB's budget that need to be paid for with rate revenues in addition to O&M costs? Grant Revenues were approximately \$84,000 in FY2012 and \$52,000 in FY2013. What amount of such revenues have been received to date in FY2015; and what is the likely level of such revenues expected for the remainder of FY2015? Are there any circumstances or limitations that would make it impossible to receive such revenues going forward? If affirmative, please provide specific references or documents that support/verify your response.

Response:

PWSB's O&M Budget only includes capital costs for capitalized labor, which is paid with rate revenues. All other capital costs are paid from the IFR fund or debt service loan proceeds.

Grant Revenue received for FY2015 amounts to \$123,091 and has already been received. This revenue consists of \$56,054 of debt forgiveness on RICWFA Bonds and a one-time grant \$67,037 from National Grid for the purchase and installation of energy conservation equipment. The PWSB will not receive any more grant revenue in FY2015.

The PWSB is not aware of any circumstances or limitations that would make it impossible to receive such revenues going forward. However, the revenue for debt forgiveness is restricted to the debt service fund. See the attached schedule Cumb. 3-5 that documents future Grant Revenue on a fiscal year basis. The amounts reported on this Schedule agree with the debt service schedules provided in Tab D, Index Item 2.9(f). To obtain this same type of grant revenue in the future, the PWSB would have to undertake a borrowing that has similar debt forgiveness provisions.

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD **Schedule of Debt Forgiveness**

GL Account Numbers

					305-9510-441.90-45	306	46
Payment	Series	Series	Series	Annual Debt		Capitalizati	uo
Date	2009A	2012A	2013A	Forgiveness	ARRA Grant	Grants	
9/1/2010	231.96			231.96	Y 231.9	96	
9/1/2011	51,030.12			51,030.12	Y 51,030.	12	
9/1/2012	51,725.98	25.02		51,751.00	y 51,725.9		25.02
9/1/2013	52,653.80	1,926.31	56.73	54,636.84	v 52,653.8		3.04
9/1/2014	54,045.53	1,951.33	56.73	56,053.59			3.06
9/1/2015	55,437.26	1,976.35	19,800.30	77,213.91	55,437.		3.65
9/1/2016	52,060.95	2,026.38	19,970.50	79,057.83	57,060.9		3.88
9/1/2017	58,916.59	2,051.40	20,254.17	81,222.16	58,916.		5.57
9/1/2018	60,772.23	2,101.43	20,537.84	83,411.50	60,772.		3.27
9/1/2019	62,859.83	2,151.47	20,878.25	85,889.55	62,859.8		3.72
9/1/2020	65,179.38	2,201.50	21,275.39	88,656.27	65,179.		3.89
9/1/2021	67,730.88	2,251.53	21,729.27	91,711.68	67,730.8		08.0
9/1/2022	70,050.43	2,326.59	22,183.14	94,560.16	70,050.		9.73
9/1/2023	72,833.90	2,401.64	22,750.48	97,986.02	72,833.9		2.12
9/1/2024	75,617.36	2,476.69	23,317.83	101,411.88	75,617.3		1.52
9/1/2025	78,632.77	2,551.74	23,998.64	105,183.15	78,632.		38
	81,648.19	2,626.79	24,679.45	108,954.43	81,648.		3.24
	84,895.56	2,726.86	25,473.73	113,096.15	84,895.		.59
	88,374.89	2,826.93	26,324.75	117,526.57	88,374.8		.68
9/1/2029	91,854.21	2,926.99	27,175.77	121,956.97	91,854.		5.76
9/1/2030	95,101.59	3,027.06	28,083.52	126,212.17	95,101.		.58
9/1/2031		3,152.15	28,991.27	32,143.42	1	32,14	3.42
9/1/2032		3,202.17	30,012.48	33,214.65	•	33,21	1.65
9/1/2033			31,033.70	31,033.70	•	31,033	3.70
9/1/2034			31,884.74	31,884.74	•	31,88	1.74
9/1/2035				•	•		
9/1/2036					1		
	1,376,653.41	48,908.33	490,468.68	1,916,030.42	1,376,653.		7.01
	end Date 6/30/2011 6/30/2011 6/30/2013 6/30/2013 6/30/2014 6/30/2014 6/30/2015 6/30/2015 6/30/2016 6/30/2016 6/30/2021 6/30/2021 6/30/2021 6/30/2021 6/30/2022 6/30/2023 6/30/2023 6/30/2024 6/30/2024 6/30/2025 6/30/2025 6/30/2026 6/30/2026 6/30/2028 6/30/2028 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2031 6/30/2039 6/30/2033 6/30/2034 6/30/2034 6/30/2034 6/30/2035 6/30/2035 6/30/2035 6/30/2036 6/30/2036 6/30/2037 6/30/2038 6/30/2038 6/30/2038 6/30/2038 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039 6/30/2039	Payment Se Date 20 9/1/2010 9/1/2010 9/1/2011 51, 9/1/2014 9/1/2014 54, 9/1/2014 9/1/2014 54, 9/1/2014 9/1/2015 55, 9/1/2016 9/1/2016 57, 9/1/2019 9/1/2019 62, 9/1/2021 9/1/2024 75, 9/1/2024 9/1/2024 75, 9/1/2026 9/1/2029 91, 2029 9/1/2030 94/1/2033 9/1/2033 9/1/2034 9/1/2035 9/1/2035 9/1/2036 9/1/2036 9/1/2037 9/1/2036 9/1/2036 9/1/2036 9/1/2037 9/1/2036 9/1/2036 9/1/2036	Payment Series Series Date 2009A 20 9/1/2010 231.96 20 9/1/2011 51,030.12 1,96 9/1/2012 51,725.98 1,96 9/1/2013 52,653.80 1,9 9/1/2014 54,045.53 1,9 9/1/2015 55,437.26 1,9 9/1/2016 57,060.95 2,2 9/1/2017 58,916.59 2,2 9/1/2018 62,859.83 2,2 9/1/2020 67,730.88 2,2 9/1/2021 67,730.88 2,2 9/1/2022 72,833.90 2,4 9/1/2024 75,617.36 2,6 9/1/2025 72,833.90 2,2 9/1/2026 81,648.19 2,6 9/1/2027 84,895.56 2,7 9/1/2039 91,854.21 2,9 9/1/2030 95,101.59 3,0 9/1/2033 9/1/2034 9/1/2035 9/1/2034 9/1/2035 9/1/203	Payment Series Series Series Ser 9/1/2010 231.96 2012A 201 9/1/2011 51,030.12 25.02 9/1/2012 51,725.98 25.02 9/1/2014 54,045.53 1,951.33 9/1/2014 54,045.53 1,951.33 9/1/2014 54,045.53 1,951.33 9/1/2015 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,9 9/1/2016 57,060.95 2,026.38 19,9 9/1/2015 58,916.59 2,026.38 19,9 9/1/2016 57,730.88 2,251.33 20,5 9/1/2021 67,730.88 2,251.53 21,7 9/1/2022 72,833.90 2,401.64 22,7 9/1/2024 75,617.36 2,401.64 22,7 9/1/2025 72,833.90 2,401.64 22,4 9/1/2026 81,648.19 2,626.79 24,6 9/1/2027 84,895.56 2,726.86 25,4 9/1/2039 91,854.21 2,926.99 27,1	Payment Series Series Series Annual Debt Date 2009A 2012A 2013A Forgiveness 9/1/2011 231.96 25.02 21.03A 231.96 9/1/2012 51,725.98 25.02 54,636.84 21.751.00 9/1/2013 52,653.80 1,956.31 56,73 54,636.84 9/1/2014 51,725.98 1,961.33 56,73 56,053.59 9/1/2014 55,406.95 1,976.35 19,970.50 77,213.91 9/1/2016 55,407.26 1,976.35 19,970.50 77,213.91 9/1/2016 55,406.95 2,051.47 20,537.84 83,411.50 9/1/2021 67,730.88 2,251.53 21,729.27 91,711.68 9/1/2022 70,650.43 2,251.53 21,729.27 91,711.68 9/1/2023 72,833.90 2,401.64 22,753.4 83,411.50 9/1/2024 75,617.36 2,251.53 21,729.27 91,411.18 9/1/2025 72,637.37 21,241.66 91,734.89 </td <td>Payment Series Series Series Annual Debt ARRI Date 2009A 2012A 2013A Forgiveness ARRI 911/2011 231.96 2009A 2013A 2013A Y 911/2013 51,725.98 25.02 25.02 51,751.00 Y 911/2014 51,030.12 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2015 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2016 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2016 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2016 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2017 58,916.59 2,051.40 20,257.47 81,222.16 Y 911/2021 67,730.88 2,261.53 2,175.34 94,560.16 91,600.30 77,213.91 911/2022 70,60.43 2,226.59 2,2183.4 2,261.83 94,660.16<td>Payment Series Series Annual Debt Capitaliza Date 2009A 2012A 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 231.96 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 231.96 200.2.2 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 51,026.12 1,986.31 55.02 2013B 4 51,026.98 1,256.98 9/1/2014 51,026.98 1,996.31 190.03.12 7 51,026.98 1,196.38</td></td>	Payment Series Series Series Annual Debt ARRI Date 2009A 2012A 2013A Forgiveness ARRI 911/2011 231.96 2009A 2013A 2013A Y 911/2013 51,725.98 25.02 25.02 51,751.00 Y 911/2014 51,030.12 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2015 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2016 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2016 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2016 55,437.26 1,976.35 19,800.30 77,213.91 Y 911/2017 58,916.59 2,051.40 20,257.47 81,222.16 Y 911/2021 67,730.88 2,261.53 2,175.34 94,560.16 91,600.30 77,213.91 911/2022 70,60.43 2,226.59 2,2183.4 2,261.83 94,660.16 <td>Payment Series Series Annual Debt Capitaliza Date 2009A 2012A 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 231.96 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 231.96 200.2.2 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 51,026.12 1,986.31 55.02 2013B 4 51,026.98 1,256.98 9/1/2014 51,026.98 1,996.31 190.03.12 7 51,026.98 1,196.38</td>	Payment Series Series Annual Debt Capitaliza Date 2009A 2012A 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 231.96 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 231.96 200.2.2 2013A Forgiveness ARRA Grant Grants 9/1/2011 51,026.12 1,986.31 55.02 2013B 4 51,026.98 1,256.98 9/1/2014 51,026.98 1,996.31 190.03.12 7 51,026.98 1,196.38

LEGEND: Y amount received agrees with schedule V variance - amount received does not agree with schedule

Cumb. 3-6:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-9 and Schedule DGB-1] When you capitalize some of your labor expenses to a capital improvement project are those labor costs recovered over time through debt service payments associated with the debt issued to pay for those capital improvements? If negative, please explain in detail why this is not the case? If those same labor costs are also expensed in a given year, and thus included in the total revenue requirement, wouldn't there be a double recovery of those expenses over time? If negative, please explain in detail why this is not the case? Please provide the amounts of labor costs that have been capitalized in fiscal years 2011 through 2014 and the current expected amount for FY2015.

Response:

Capitalized labor costs are not recovered over time through debt service payments because employee labor costs are only recovered from rate revenue authorized for operation and maintenance costs. Therefore, there is no double recovery of these costs. See Schedule Cumb. 3-6 for capitalized labor for fiscal years FY2011 through FY2014. The amount for FY2015 cannot be estimated at this time. The actual amount will be determined after year end during the year-end close period in preparation for the annual audit.

AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD	
AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARI	
AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARI	
AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOAR	Ω
AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOA	-4
AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BO	_
AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY B (\geq
AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY	\simeq
AWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY	
AWTUCKET WATER SUPP	_
AWTUCKET WATER SUP	_
AWTUCKET WATER SU	_
AWTUCKET WATER SL	_
AWTUCKET WATER	ي
AWTUCKET WATER	(J
AWTUCKET WATE	$\mathbf{\alpha}$
AWTUCKET WAT	
AWTUCKET WA	\vdash
AWTUCKET M	٩
AWTUCKET 	~
AWTUCK	
AWTUCK	
AWTUC	
AWTU	4 6
₩	\simeq
⋚	
⋛	
◂	5

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD Capitalized Labor Schedule Cumb 3-6	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14
CAPITALIZED LABOR				
Transmission & Distribution Department	293,077.00	99,717.00	310,655.00	306,882.00
Engineering Department	61,097.00	186,539.00	201,362.00	213,813.00
Metering Department	63,834.00	56,002.00	51,274.00	44,489.00
Total Deductions	418,008.00	342,258.00	563,291.00	565,184.00

Set 3

Cumb. 3-7:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-10 and Schedule DGB-1] What was the total "refunding loss" that resulted from PWSB's 2003 refunding of the Pawtucket Public Building Authority bonds? How many years was it amortized over, and what were the beginning and ending years of the amortization period? Was this refunding approved by the RIPUC and/or other regulatory agencies? Was any portion or all of the resulting loss avoidable or due to actions/inactions of the PWSB?

Response:

Please see the attached schedule for the total "refunding loss" that resulted from PWSB's 2003 refunding of the Pawtucket Public Building Authority bonds. This schedule includes the total "refunding loss" for each debt issue. The refunding losses were audited by the PWSB's independent auditors. This schedule also contains the beginning and ending of the amortization period. Yes, the refunding was approved by the PUC and/or other regulatory agencies. The PWSB undertook this refunding as part of the borrowings that financed the PWSB's new water treatment plant and a portion of the PWSB's distribution system rehabilitation. The PBA debt had to be defeased for the PWSB to borrow the necessary funds from the RICWFA, so there was no portion of the "resulting loss avoidable or due to actions/inactions of the PWSB." For more detailed information, please see the PWSB's past Dockets in which these issues were addressed in detail by the PUC, specifically, Dockets 3378 and 3497.

Prepared by:

R. Benson with input from Maureen Gurghigian of First Southwest Company

PWSB

Deferred Refunding Losses For the year ended 6/30/2014

Deferred Deferred Deferred Refunding Loss Series 2003A

Deferred Series 2003B

GL Account # 305-0000-199.11-00 305-0000-199.12-00

Date	Description	Account Balance	Account Balance
12/30/2003	Loss on 2003 refunding of old debt remaining life of old debt (years)	1,044,808.86 13	1,291,156.99 9
	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.89
	Original balance/Balance forward less: FY04 amortization	1,044,808.86 80,369.92	1,291,156.99 143,461.89
6/30/2004	Beginning Balance	964,438.94	1,147,695.10
6/30/2005	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.89
6/30/2005	Balance per year end general ledger	884,069.02	1,004,233.21
6/30/2006	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.89
6/30/2006	Balance per year end general ledger	803,699.10	860,771.32
6/30/2007	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.89
	Balance per year end general ledger	723,329.18	717,309.43
6/30/2008	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.89
	Balance per year end general ledger	642,959.26	573,847.54
	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.89
6/30/2009	Balance per year end general ledger	562,589.34	430,385.65
6/30/2010	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.89
6/30/2010	Balance per year end general ledger	482,219.42	286,923.76
6/30/2011	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.89
6/30/2011	Balance per year end general ledger	401,849.50	143,461.87
6/30/2012	Annual amortization	80,369.92	143,461.87
6/30/2012	Balance per year end general ledger	321,479.58	
6/30/2013	Annual amortization	80,369.92	
	Balance per year end general ledger	241,109.66	
0/20/2014	Annual are estimation	00 200 02	
	Annual amortization	80,369.92	
0/30/2014	Balance per year end general ledger	160,739.74	
6/30/2015	Annual amortization		
6/30/2015	Balance per year end general ledger		
6/30/2016	Annual amortization		
6/30/2016	Balance per year end general ledger		

Prepared by:

Date:

Reviewed by:

Cumb. 3-8:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-11 and Schedule DGB-2] On Sch. DGB-2 (page 4 of 4) IFR Expenditures are shown to be about \$100,000 in FY 2011 and FY2012, and zero in both FY2013 and FY2014. Is this because there were little or no funds added to that Account during those years. How much was spent on infrastructure improvements in each of those years and how were they funded beyond the relatively small amounts withdrawn from that Account? As part of this proposed increase has PWSB provided for enough revenues such that it will be able to add \$2.5 million to that Account each year from FY 2016 through FY2018? If negative, what is the plan for funding this Account for each of those years?

Response:

The figures on DGB-2 for IFR Expenditures shown to be about \$100,000 in FY 2011 and FY2012, and zero in both FY2013 and FY2014 reflect the GAAP basis expenditure. Since GAAP has expenditures for the purchase or construction of major asset capitalized DGB-2 does not reflect the spending for these capital purchases. The amounts which are shown on DGB-2 as stated in the response to Cumb. 1-11 represented the expense for the engineering salary for the project manager whose salary was not capitalized for that period. Furthermore, the project engineer completed his IFR related assignments during FY 2012 which is why no balances show up for FY 2013 and FY 2014. The amounts drawn from the IFR account, which are not reflected on DGB-2 because the amounts were capitalized, were \$881,139 for FY 2011, \$1,341,928 for FY 2012, \$3,425,059 for FY 2013 and \$2,593,693 for FY 2014. These amounts are also reflected on the revision to the response to Cumb. 1-19. The rates proposed by the PWSB will provide enough revenues to add \$2.5 million to the IFR Account *if* its consumption meets the targeted level set in this Docket. Under the PWSB's Trust Indenture, the IFR account is among the last accounts to be funded. Therefore, if the PWSB does not sell the amount of water ultimately forecasted in this Docket, this account will be underfunded. Thus, the setting of a realistic consumption number in this Docket is critical.

Prepared by: D. Bebyn and R. Benson

Set 3

Cumb. 3-9: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-11 and Testimony Page 4, lines 5 -9]

As previously requested, please provide a detailed breakdown of the three accounting adjustments [dollar amounts, specific accounts adjusted and the year(s) involved] specified in this Test Year "Adjustment" (M), along with an explanation of how each specifically

affects funding of the IFR Account.

Response: The Test year adjustment Mincluded adding \$7,632 to IFR from Road

Resurfacing and \$2,593,693 of capital purchases that were made from the IFR reserve account. However as stated in my testimony, this amount was only adjusted to the level of funding granted and required to be restricted in the last rate filing. Since this adjustment was a Test Year

adjustment only the expenditures for FY 2014 were involved.

Prepared by: D. Bebyn

Cumb. 3-10: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-11 and Schedule DGB-2] Please provide your best estimates of the line item amounts shown in DGB-2 corresponding to FY2015 based on 10 months of actual data and 2 months of estimated data. As early as possible in June revise these amounts based on 11 months of actual date and 1 month of estimated data (June 2015). Lastly, as soon as possible provide an update to that schedule based entirely of 12 months of actual data.

Objection:

Objection, this request is unreasonable and burdensome. Rule 1.18 (c) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure allows a party to issue data requests for "data, studies, workpapers, reports and information reasonably relevant to the proceeding..." This request essentially calls for the PWSB to recreate its test year in same form as Schedule DGB-2 using estimated figures for FY15. This would require the PWSB and Mr. Bebyn to evaluate ten months of financial information that is currently available for FY15. This information would then have to be examined and properly adjusted. The PWSB and Mr. Bebyn would then have to completely estimate financial information for the remaining two months of FY15. The PWSB believes this task would require Mr. Benson and Mr. Bebyn to expend approximately two to three full days. The actual FY15 information can be provided after the close of the fiscal year and after accruals post and audit adjustments are made.

Prepared by: Joseph A. Keough Jr., Esquire

To The Town of Cumberland's

Data Requests

Set 3

Cumb. 3-11: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-18] With respect to item 1 of your response – how many employees will be required to work on the 2.5 holidays that they didn't have to work on? Assuming it was about 50, PWSB would have 125 additional man-days of work (or 1,000 manhours). Has PWSB factored into its proposed revenue requirements a level of overtime labor hours and dollar amounts? If so, what are they? With respect to item 2 of your response – what is PWSB's estimate of the "offset" attributable to "increased employee co-pay(s)?"

Response:

All PWSB employees, except those in the Teamsters Union, are required to work the 2.5 days that were holidays in the expired union contracts. A new Teamster contract is still in negotiations and these 10 employees will continue to have these 2.5 paid holidays until there is a new bargaining agreement.

PWSB estimates overtime dollar amounts in its revenue requirements. The estimated overtime dollar amounts are as follows:

Transmission & Distribution Department	\$93 <i>,</i> 077
Engineering	6,545
Customer Service	740
Metering	1,021
Total Overtime Budget	\$101,383

Overtime is incurred for the following reasons and will not be affected by changes to the holiday schedule:

- a. Off hour emergency repairs to the transmission and distribution system
- b. Construction contractor oversight on weekends and holidays
- c. Extended office hours per PUC Regulations for days performing water service shut-offs.

PWSB estimates the current annual increased offset to the health and dental insurance expense to be \$7,804.

Cumb. 3-12: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-19] Please reconcile the level of "IFR Expenditures" reported on Sch. DGB-2 (page 4 of 4) and the level of "Funds withdrawn from the IFR Account," provided in your response to Cumb. 1-19? What amounts were deposited into the IFR Fund during each of the five years shown in your response, and what was the balance in the IFR Fund at the end of each of those five years? What amounts, as part of this case, has PWSB estimated would be added to and withdrawn from the IFR Fund each year between 2015 and 2018 (the balance at the end of FY2014 is \$2,367,407.71 as reported on Sch. CUMB 1-7)?

Response: See attached Schedule 3-12.

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD Infrastructure Replacement Fund Account

Reconciliation of DGB-2	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014					
IFR Expenditures reported on DBG-2		101,511	88,134	0	0					
beduct: Project Manager salaries & benefits A Lis		(101,511)	(88,134)							
Add: CIP Expenditures paid from the Restricted IFR account	734,488	881,139	1,341,928	3,425,059	2,593,693					
Amounts reported on Cumo 1-19 and IFR account schedule below	734,488	881,139	1,341,928	3,425,059	2,593,693					
IFR Resticted Cash Account	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
Beginning Cash Balance	\$ 365,239.08	365,239.08 \$ 3,749,383.49	\$ 3,642,191.57	\$ 4,506,872.90	\$ 3,166,255.97	\$ 2,367,407.71	\$ 3,799,317.56	\$ 3,740,275.56	\$ 3,329,175.56	\$ 1,256,875.56
Revenue Receipts Total Additions	\$ 4,118,632.19	\$ 773,947.48	\$ 2,206,609.04	\$ 2,084,441.79	\$ 1,794,844.87	\$ 2,426,909.85	\$ 2,500,000.00	\$ 2,500,000.00	\$ 2,500,000.00	\$ 2,500,000.00
Expenditures - Capital Improvement Program Total Deductions	\$ 734,487.78	\$ 881,139.40	\$ 1,341,927.71	\$ 3,425,058.72	\$ 2,593,693.13	\$ 995,000.00	\$ 2,559,042.00	\$ 2,911,100.00	\$ 4,572,300.00	\$ 3,736,400.00
Ending Cash Balance	\$ 3,749,383.49	\$ 3,642,191.57	\$ 4,506,872.90	\$ 3,166,255.97	\$ 2,367,407.71	\$ 3,799,317.56	\$ 3,740,275.56	\$ 3,329,175.56	\$ 3,329,175.56	\$ 20,475.56

Cumb. 3-13: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-20] With respect to your attachment listing all the streets included in MR-10 and the detailed cost estimate, what portion (dollar amount and percentage) of the cost estimate is attributable to mains that are larger than 12 inches in diameter, and what portion (dollar amount and percentage) of the cost estimate is attributable to mains that are only in the Town of Cumberland? Assuming the funds needed for this project (MR-10) are approved near the end of this year or in early 2016, what is a realistic schedule for completing a portion of the streets in FY2016 (number of streets and dollar amount); in FY2017 (number of streets and dollar amount); and FY2018 (number of streets and dollar amount)?

Response:

MR-10 consists of replacing 6' and 8" mains. In the process there may be small sections of 12" and larger pipe that need to be replaced in order to facilitate the new connections. The exact dollar amount and percentage is unknown at this point. The PWSB has replaced or cleaned and lined all of our transmission piping in earlier projects. Typically, the PWSB completes 90% of the piping work in our projects during the season in which the contract is awarded, so based on that I would estimate that we would expend approximately \$4.96 million in FY16, and that we would complete the remainder in FY17.

Prepared by: J. DeCelles

Cumb. 3-14: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-20] In describing the benefits of the project you state - "The new pipes will be cement lined ductile iron and will significantly increase flow capacity as well as eliminate water quality issues associated with unlined cast iron. The replacement will also increase fire-fighting capabilities in these areas." Is the current flow capacity of any of the pipe segments to be replaced below PWSB's standards or causing significant low flow problems to customers? If so, specify which pipe segments and describe the variance from the standard or the problem impacting some customers. Is the current water quality from any of the pipe segments to be replaced below PWSB's standards or causing significant quality problems for customers? If so, specify which pipe segments and describe the variance from the standard or the problem impacting some customers. Is the current fire-fighting capacity of any of the pipe segments to be replaced below PWSB's or industry standards for fire-fighting capacity? If so, specify which pipe segments and describe the variance from the standard.

Response:

To our knowledge, none of the pipe segments to be replaced are below ISO Fire Flow Standards or are causing significant low flow problems. The project will improve the flow capacity of the pipes and improve flow characteristics. The project will also improve the efficiency of our pumping efforts by removing flow restrictions. The pipes in the project area do experience periodic "dirty water " during high flow events like hot summer days or fire flow in the vicinity. One of the main reasons the PWSB and the City of Pawtucket decided to undertake a complete rehabilitation of the transmission and distribution system in the late 1990's and early 2000's was to improve the water quality and reliability of the entire system. Prior to the commencement of the system-wide rehabilitation, the PWSB's customers experienced numerous water quality issues and service interruptions due to main breaks. The issues related to the PWSB's system-wide rehabilitation project have been fully addressed before the PUC, specifically in Dockets 3378 and 3497. As set forth above, to our knowledge, none of the pipe segments to be replaced are below ISO Fire Flow Standards.

Prepared by: J. DeCelles

Cumb. 3-15: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-20] With respect to your response of the question what would the impacts (specific) be of a one year delay in this project, you responded as follows – "While no one can be certain, the delay would likely result in increased construction costs due to inflation, as well as the potential for unnecessary maintenance costs due to leaks and other issues. Any delays in the project could also result in increased interest rates for project loans." By how much do you believe construction costs are likely to increase by over the next year or two due to inflation? Is it also possible that construction inflation rates over this short term timeframe could be 1% or lower? Is the potential for unnecessary maintenance costs due to leaks and other issues relatively high or relatively low? In the past 2 years (FY 2014 and FY2015 to date), which of the mains to be replaced as part of this project experienced significant leaks in terms of lost water and high repair cost? Please list the location, date and cost of repair for each such leak. By how much do you believe interest rates on PWSB loans are likely to increase by over the next year or two? Is it also possible that such interest rates over this short term timeframe could remain unchanged? Are you aware that such rates have either decreased or not increased significantly in recent years?

Response:

There is no way to definitively predict construction costs if the PWSB delayed this project. We do know that the cost of water works materials has steadily increased in recent years and the fixed costs for items such as police details have also increased. I would not anticipate either of those costs will decrease. The actual construction costs seem to fluctuate inversely with the economy. When the economy is slow, our experience is that the costs in response to our project bids are lower, which may be attributable to the scarcity of work and increased competition. However, in good economic times, our experience is that the responses to project bids contain higher costs. So if the local economy improves, the construction costs are more likely to increase.

It difficult to say whether the potential for unnecessary maintenance costs due to leaks and other issues is relatively high or relatively low? The PWSB would need to know the frame of reference assumed in this question. However, it would stand to reason that older pipe that is not replaced or re-lined is more likely to need maintenance that could be avoided if it were replaced or re-lined.

To determine which of the mains to be replaced as part of this project experienced "significant" leaks in terms of lost water and "high" repair cost in the past two years (FY 2014 and FY2015 to date) would be very difficult. First, the terms "significant" and "high" are undefined in this question. Second, this project encompasses 35,562 linear feet of pipe on numerous streets in two cities. To determine the amount and cost of repairs on the streets in this project for the past two years would require someone to go through thousands of work orders and determine which work was on the project streets. This would be an extremely time consuming project that the PWSB is unable to complete at this time. However, the PWSB can supply the Town of Cumberland with all work orders for the two year period requested for its own review.

Finally, the PWSB does not know how much interest rates are likely to increase over the next year or two, or whether they will remain unchanged. The PWSB does not know which "recent years" Cumberland refers to in its question, but attached is a Bond Buyer's Index supplied by the PWSB's financial advisor, First Southwest Company that sets forth an index of interest rates.

Prepared by: J. DeCelles, with information provided by First Southwest Company

FIRST SOUTHWEST COMPANY "Bond Buyer's" Index of 25 Revenue Bonds Basis Valuation of Par Bonds

The most important guide as to what the Municipal Revenue Bond Market has done in one time period versus another is the "Bond Buyer's" 25 Revenue Bond Index. Published on Thursday of each week, it is the accepted guide of the Municipal Bond Industry to determine trends and movements of interest rates in the market. The Index is based on 30 year revenue bonds of 25 issuers rated from "Aaa" to "Baa 1" by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. and from "AAA" to "A" by Standard & Poor's Corporation. Bonds in the Index include Housing, Transportation, Hospital and Pollution Control Credits.

January	Week 1 2 3 4 5	2003 5.16 5.20 5.20 5.17 5.20	2004 5.03 4.92 4.94 5.02	2005 4.98 4.92 4.89 4.90	2006 5.09 5.11 5.08 5.15	2007 4.50 4.55 4.55 4.59	2008 4.72 4.66 4.63 4.71 4.76	2009 6.00 5.90 5.72 5.82 5.89	2010 4.96 4.93 4.91 4.99	2011 5.44 5.60 5.66 5.61	2012 4.93 4.74 4.77 4.71	2013 4.30 4.26 4.22 4.24 4.29	2014 5.39 5.34 5.33 5.28 530	2015 4.26 4.06 4.08 4.06
February	1 2 3 4 5	5.20 5.16 5.14 5.10	4.96 4.85 4.83 4.81	4.86 4.79 4.88 4.93	5.17 5.14 5.09 5.04	4.59 4.53 4.51 4.48	4.72 4.82 4.94 5.22	5.74 5.67 5.70 5.76	4.96 4.96 4.97 4.94	5.63 5.67 5.60 5.57	4.70 4.77 4.74 4.75	4.29 4.30 4.30 4.29	5.32 5.33 5.27 5.22	4.16 4.23 4.28 4.28
March	1 2 3 4 5	5.06 5.06 5.17 5.17	4.85 4.75 4.73 4.79	4.96 5.02 4.99 5.04 5.03	5.07 5.11 5.08 5.08 5.14	4.41 4.39 4.38 4.41 4.48	5.11 5.15 5.17 5.24	5.80 5.83 5.81 5.78	4.93 4.92 4.92 4.93 4.94	5.56 5.52 5.50 5.52 5.56	4.73 4.76 4.83 4.88 4.85	4.31 4.41 4.37 4.35	5.27 5.26 5.30 5.26	4.32 4.31 4.19 4.17
April	1 2 3 4 5	5.20 5.19 5.16 5.11	4.91 5.07 5.18 5.20 5.28	5.02 4.98 4.89 4.83	5.16 5.18 5.20 5.22	4.50 4.49 4.43 4.45	5.18 5.04 5.06 5.10	5.75 5.74 5.63 5.49 5.57	4.96 4.96 4.93 4.91	5.61 5.58 5.54 5.51	4.88 4.85 4.81 4.78	4.33 4.30 4.28 4.29	5.23 5.18 5.12 5.13	4.18 4.18 4.18 4.22 4.31
May	1 2 3 4 5	5.09 5.01 4.88 4.82 4.82	5.32 5.45 5.44 5.36	4.84 4.87 4.81 4.78	5.24 5.25 5.24 5.22	4.45 4.44 4.46 4.55 4.57	5.07 5.07 4.98 4.99 5.05	5.57 5.46 5.42 5.53	4.89 4.90 4.86 4.84	5.45 5.41 5.40 5.38	4.77 4.73 4.75 4.76 4.73	4.19 4.22 4.25 4.30 4.39	5.10 4.97 4.81 4.81 4.79	4.47 4.48 4.56 4.48
June	1 2 3 4 5	4.83 4.78 4.89 4.97	5.39 5.42 5.40 5.37	4.72 4.75 4.83 4.76 4.77	5.23 5.18 5.20 5.27 5.31	4.69 4.77 4.74 4.71	5.04 5.14 5.20 5.25	5.63 5.76 5.78 5.77	4.81 4.82 4.86 4.85	5.33 5.34 5.32 5.31 5.34	4.80 4.75 4.72 4.69	4.47 4.62 4.81 4.91	4.82 4.80 4.80 4.76	
July	1 2 3 4 5	4.99 5.00 5.10 5.20	5.34 5.26 5.27 5.26 5.31	4.82 4.84 4.87 4.86	5.31 5.21 5.19 5.13	4.70 4.71 4.67 4.63	5.14 5.04 5.11 5.23 5.20	5.76 5.70 5.66 5.67 5.66	4.84 4.79 4.77 4.78 4.80	5.36 5.30 5.32 5.32	4.65 4.56 4.51 4.44	4.87 4.91 4.90 5.03	4.90 5.03 5.07 4.99 4.93	
August	1 2 3 4 5	5.42 5.42 5.50 5.41 5.40	5.24 5.15 5.12 5.13	4.90 4.93 4.88 4.87	5.06 5.02 4.97 4.93 4.91	4.66 4.67 4.75 4.89 4.83	5.23 5.17 5.15 5.17	5.68 5.66 5.62 5.59	4.79 4.74 4.69 4.61	5.21 5.09 5.10 5.13	4.46 4.50 4.52 4.49 4.45	5.05 5.05 5.18 5.29 5.30	4.89 4.86 4.85 4.80	
September	1 2 3 4 5	5.41 5.32 5.24 5.22	5.09 5.07 5.03 4.97	4.83 4.87 4.96 4.98 5.04	4.88 4.85 4.79 4.77	4.81 4.69 4.76 4.77	5.15 5.09 5.44 5.56	5.43 5.33 4.98 4.86	4.63 4.65 4.63 4.58 4.59	5.15 5.07 5.11 4.96 5.01	4.43 4.42 4.37 4.31	5.35 5.31 5.24 5.17	4.83 4.86 4.90 4.78	
October	1 2 3 4 5	5.20 5.34 5.34 5.25 5.24	5.02 5.08 4.99 4.93 4.97	5.06 5.11 5.13 5.21	4.77 4.76 4.79 4.78	4.72 4.78 4.73 4.67	5.69 5.97 6.48 6.06 6.09	4.69 4.69 4.86 4.87 4.95	4.58 4.57 4.60 4.67	5.04 5.06 5.07 5.10	4.28 4.32 4.33 4.33	5.17 5.23 5.25 5.16 5.14	4.72 4.65 4.46 4.49 4.53	
November	1 2 3 4 5	5.23 5.17 5.09 5.09	4.99 5.10 5.07 5.07	5.24 5.24 5.21 5.20	4.61 4.60 4.60 4.60 4.55	4.73 4.85 4.85 4.80 4.77	6.02 5.98 5.98 6.06	5.01 5.02 5.04 5.03	4.71 4.87 5.25 5.16	5.05 5.00 5.09 5.06	4.29 4.23 4.17 4.14 4.08	5.18 5.23 5.26 5.23	4.61 4.62 4.62 4.58	
December	1 2 3 4 5	5.19 5.15 5.06 5.04 5.05	5.15 4.99 4.95 5.00 5.04	5.23 5.20 5.19 5.15 5.11	4.53 4.52 4.53 4.56	4.74 4.79 4.76 4.80	6.17 6.39 6.22 6.07	4.98 4.93 4.92 4.94 4.95	5.18 5.32 5.48 5.42 5.38	5.09 5.03 5.01 5.01 4.97	4.06 4.12 4.26 4.28	5.30 5.37 5.40 5.33	4.50 4.41 4.43 4.43 4.39	

Cumb. 3-16: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-21] With respect to your attachment listing all the streets included in CL-6 and the detailed cost estimate, what portion (dollar amount and percentage) of the cost estimate is attributable to mains that are larger than 12 inches in diameter? Assuming the funds needed for this project (CL-6) are approved near the end of FY2016, what is a realistic schedule for completing a portion of the streets in FY2016 (number of streets and dollar amount), if any; in FY2017 (number of streets and dollar amount); and in FY2018 (number of streets and dollar amount)?

Response:

CL-6 consists of cleaning and lining mainly 6" and 8" mains. In the process there may be small sections of 12" and larger pipe that need to be replaced in order to facilitate the new connections. The PWSB has replaced or cleaned and lined all of our transmission piping in earlier projects. Typically the PWSB completes 90% of the piping work in our projects during the season in which the contract is awarded, which would mean that the bulk of the work, approximately \$3.87 million, would take place in the very end of FY16 and the beginning of FY 17. There would likely be a minor amount of work in the spring of FY17.

Prepared by: J. DeCelles

Set 3

Cumb. 3-17:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-21] In describing the benefits of the project you state - "The cleaned and lined pipes will significantly increase flow capacity as well as eliminate water quality issues associated with unlined cast iron. The cleaning and lining will also increase fire-fighting capabilities in these areas." Is the current flow capacity of any of the pipe segments to be cleaned and lined below PWSB's standards or causing significant low flow problems to customers? If so, specify which pipe segments and describe the variance from the standard or the problem impacting some customers. Is the current water quality from any of the pipe segments to be cleaned and lined below PWSB's standards or causing significant quality problems for customers. If so, specify which pipe segments and describe the variance from the standard or the problem impacting some customers. Is the current fire-fighting capacity of any of the pipe segments to be cleaned and lined below PWSB's or industry standards for fire-fighting capacity? If so, specify which pipe segments and describe the variance from the standard.

Response:

To our knowledge, none of the pipe segments to be replaced are below ISO Fire Flow Standards or are causing significant low flow problems. The project will improve the flow capacity of the pipes and improve flow characteristics. The new pipes also improve the efficiency of our pumping efforts by removing flow restrictions. The pipes in the project area do experience periodic "dirty water " during high flow events like hot summer days or fire flow in the vicinity. One of the main reasons the PWSB and the City of Pawtucket decided to undertake a complete rehabilitation of the transmission and distribution system in the late 1990's and early 2000's was to improve the water quality and reliability of the entire system. Prior to the commencement of the system-wide rehabilitation, the PWSB's customers experienced numerous water quality issues and service interruptions due to main breaks. The issues related to the PWSB's system-wide rehabilitation project have been fully addressed before the PUC, specifically in Dockets 3378 and 3497. As set forth above, to our knowledge, none of the pipe segments to be replaced are below ISO Fire Flow Standards.

Prepared by: J. DeCelles

Cumb. 3-18: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-21] With respect to your response of the question what would the impacts (specific) be of a one year delay in this project, you responded as follows – "While no one can be certain, the delay would likely result in increased construction costs due to inflation, as well as the potential for unnecessary maintenance costs due to leaks and other issues. Any delays in the project could also result in increased interest rates for project loans." By how much do you believe construction costs are likely to increase by over the next year or two due to inflation? Is it also possible that construction inflation rates over this short term timeframe could be 1% or lower? Is the potential for unnecessary maintenance costs due to leaks and other issues relatively high or relatively low? In the past 2 years (FY2014 and FY2015 to date), which of the mains to be cleaned and lined as part of this project experienced significant leaks in terms of lost water and high repair cost? Please list the location, date and cost of repair for each such leak. By how much do you believe interest rates on PWSB loans are likely to increase by over the next year or two? Is it also possible that such interest rates over this short term timeframe could remain unchanged? Are you aware that such rates have either not increased significantly or have decreased in recent years?

Response:

There is no way to definitively predict construction costs if the PWSB delayed this project. We do know that the cost of water works materials has steadily increased in recent years and the fixed costs for items such as police details have also increased. I would not anticipate either of those costs will decrease. The actual construction costs fluctuate inversely with the economy. When the economy is slow, our experience is that the costs in response to our project bids are lower, which may be attributable to the scarcity of work and increased competition. However, in good economic times, our experience is that the responses to project bids contain higher costs. So if the local economy improves, the construction costs are more likely to increase.

It difficult to say whether the potential for unnecessary maintenance costs due to leaks and other issues is relatively high or relatively low? The PWSB would need to know the frame of reference assumed in this question. However, it would stand to reason that older pipe that is not

replaced or re-lined is more likely to need maintenance that could be avoided if it were replaced or re-lined.

To determine which of the mains to be replaced as part of this project experienced "significant" leaks in terms of lost water and "high" repair cost in the past two years (FY 2014 and FY2015 to date) would be very difficult. First, the terms "significant" and "high" are undefined in this question. Second, this project encompasses 41,828 linear feet of pipe on numerous streets in two cities. To determine the amount and cost of repairs on the streets in this project for the past two years would require someone to go through thousands of work orders and determine which work was on the project streets. This would be an extremely time consuming project that the PWSB is unable to complete at this time. However, the PWSB can supply the Town of Cumberland with all work orders for the two year period requested for its own review.

Finally, the PWSB does not know how much interest rates are likely to increase over the next year or two, or whether they will remain unchanged. The PWSB does not know which "recent years" Cumberland refers to in its question, but the attachment to Cumb. 3-15 is a Bond Buyer's Index supplied by the PWSB's financial advisor, First Southwest Company that sets forth an index of interest rates.

Prepared by: J. DeCelles, with information provided by First Southwest Company

Cumb. 3-19: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-22 and Cumb. 1-23] From your response to these two Information Requests it appears that you plan to fund the IFR Fund with \$7.5 million for the 3 years of the rate period (FY 2016 – FY 2018) and will only spend \$582,500 on "further distribution" work" over that period (MR-10 and CL-6 will be funded with new debt). What will the remaining \$6.9 million be used for? Please provide detailed descriptions of all other projects that will be funded from the IFR Fund and completed before the end of FY2018 along with realistic schedules of when these projects will be started and completed. In providing these additional IFR funded projects and scheduled construction, keep in mind that PWSB has stated (as part of this case) it will complete MR-10 and CL-6 and nearly \$600,000 of additional distribution work over this same period, which is effectively only 2.5 years (as half of FY2016 will have been completed before this case is resolved).

Response:

The IFR will be used extensively over this period for a variety of projects as highlighted below. Please see attached. The number, scope, and timing of projects will depend on the collection and availability of these funds.

Prepared by: J. DeCelles

20 YEAR CIP PROJECTS											
PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOAF	RD										
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN PR	COIFCTS										
Updated as of											
opuated as of	Funding										
Project Name	Source		FY 2015		FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018	ı	FY 2019
Land Acquisition	RES/WRB										
Watershed Security Fencing	IRF	\$	40,000	٠.	40,000	\$	40,000	\$	40,000	\$	40,000
Well Rehabilitation (2A, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9)	IRF	\$	15,000	\$	15,000	\$	15,000	\$	15,000	\$	15,000
Well Station Rehabilition (Eng/Perm/Const) 3	IRF			\$	150,000						
Well Station Rehabilition (Eng/Perm/Const) 4	IRF			\$	150,000						
Well Station Rehabilition (Eng/Perm/Const) 5	IRF					\$	150,000				
Well Station Rehabilition (Eng/Perm/Const) 6	IRF IRF					\$	150,000	خ	150,000		
Well Station Rehabilition (Eng/Perm/Const) 7 Well Station Rehabilition (Eng/Perm/Const) 8	IRF							\$	150,000 150,000		
Well Station Rehabilition (Eng/Perm/Const) 9	IRF							\$	150,000		
EAP for all Dams & Spillways	IRF			\$	100,000			7	130,000		
Happy Hollow Dam Improve (Eng/Perm/Const)	IRF			\$	600,000	Ś	1,500,000	Ś	1,500,000		
Arnold Mills Dam Improve (Eng/Perm/Const)	IRF			ŕ		Ĺ	,,	ŕ	,,	\$	250,000
Diamond Hill Dam Improve (Eng/Perm/Const)	IRF	1								Ľ	.,
Raw Water Facilities Total		\$	55,000	\$	1,055,000	\$	1,855,000	\$	2,005,000	\$	305,000
Pump Station 3 Demo (Eng/Perm/Const)	WTP			\$	300,000						
Sludge Removal	IRF			\$	171,242						
Decomission 120 Mill St WTP (Eng/Perm/Const)	IRF							\$	1,000,000	-	1,000,000
WTP Maintenance and Repairs	IRF	<u> </u>		<u> </u>						\$	500,000
Water Treatment Facilities Total		\$	-	\$	471,242	\$	-	\$	1,000,000	Ş	1,500,000
Hydraulic Model Software	IDE			,	20.000						
Hydraulic Model Software Hydraulic Model Additional Services	IRF	\$	15 000	\$	30,000						
3 MG Stump Hill Tank Rehab. (Eng/Perm/Const)	IRF	Ş	15,000	Ş	15,000						
3 MG Sturip Tilli Tarik Keriab. (Elig/Ferril/Collst)	IRF							Ś	250,000	\$	600,000
3 MG Tank Inspection	IRF					\$	2,000	7	230,000	7	000,000
10 MG Stump Hill Tank Rhb (Eng/Perm/Const)	11.11					7	2,000				
	IRF										
10 MG Tank Inspection	IRF					\$	3,000				
Lincoln Interconnection (1.2 million)	IRF										
East Providence Interconnection (4 mil.)	IRF										
MR-10 Improvements	SRF	Ş	\$3,000,000	\$	2,400,000						
CL-6 Improvements	SRF			\$	800,000	\$	3,500,000				
MR-11 Improvements	IRF							\$	582,500	\$	582,500
MR-12 Improvements	IRF										
MR-13 Improvements	IRF										
MR-14 Improvements	IRF										
MR-15 Improvements	IRF										
Leak Detection in Distribution System	IRF	<u>.</u>						\$	20,000	\$	20,000
Main, Hydrant & Service repl. (T&D) w/3% infl.	IRF	\$	90,000		92,700	\$	95,500	\$	98,400	\$	101,400
Road and sidewalk rest. (T & D) w/3% infl.	IRF	\$	230,000		236,900	\$	244,100	\$	251,500	\$	259,100
Transmission & Distribution Total		\$	3,335,000	Ş	3,574,600	Ş	3,844,600	\$	1,202,400	Ş	1,563,000
Vahialas 9 Faurinmant	IDE	خ ا	350,000	ċ	E00.000	خ	E00 000	خ	150,000	ċ	150,000
Vehicles & Equipment Asset Management	IRF IRF	\$	350,000 50,000	\$	500,000 250,000	\$	500,000	\$	150,000	\$	150,000
Computer hardware & software	IRF	\$	50,000	\$	50,000	\$	50,000	\$	50,000	\$	50,000
Misc facility repairs/installations	IRF	\$	50,000	<u> </u>	50,000	\$	50,000	\$	50,000	\$	50,000
Meter replacement (materials) w/3% infla	IRF	\$	105,000	\$	108,200	\$	111,500	\$	114,900	\$	118,400
Administration Total		\$	605,000	\$	958,200	\$	711,500	\$	364,900	\$	368,400
		Ť	,	Ė		Ė	,	Ė		Ė	
		\$	3,995,000	\$	6,059,042	\$	6,411,100	\$	4,572,300	\$	3,736,400
Grand Total											
Grand Total											
			FY 2015		FY 2016		FY 2017		FY 2018		FY 2019
Funding Source		\$	FY 2015 995,000	\$	FY 2016 2,559,042	\$	FY 2017 2,911,100	\$	FY 2018 4,572,300	-	
Funding Source Infrastructure Reserve Fund		+-		\$		-		\$		_	
Grand Total Funding Source Infrastructure Reserve Fund Debt Service Restricted Land Fund		+-	995,000	<u> </u>	2,559,042	-	2,911,100	_		\$	FY 2019 3,736,400 - -

Set 3

Cumb. 3-20: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-24] What is the balance at the end of FY2014 in each of the Funds/Accounts listed in each item in your response (1 through 3, 4a and 4b, and 5) to Cumb. 1-24? Also for each fiscal year 2015 through 2018 list PWSB's estimates of amount in and out of each of these Funds/Accounts assuming your proposed increase is approved in total. Lastly, for each Fund/Account, if the balance at the end of any year exceeds the required balance, indicate the amount of this exceedance for each of the forecast years (FY2015 through FY2018).

Response:

- 1. The O&M fund does not have any required restricted accounts or any restricted funding levels.
- 2. See attached Schedule Cumb 3-20 Debt Service Fund.
- 3. See attached Schedule Cumb 3-20 O&M Reserve Fund and the response to Cumb 3-3.
- 4. a. See attached Schedule Cumb 3-20 Plant Decommissioning Account.
- 4. b. See attached Schedule Cumb 3-20 Revenue Allowance Account.
- 5. See Schedule 3-12 for the IFR account.

Schedule CUMB 3-20 Plant Decommissioning Account

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD Plant Decommissioning Account

	FY14	FV15	FV16	FV17	FY18	FY19
Beginning Cash Balance - July 1	727,808.73	735,835.33	743,193.68	450,625.62	455,131.88	459,683.20
Additions						
Investment income	8,026.60	7,358.35	7,431.94	4,506.26	4,551.32	4,596.83
Total Additions	8,026.60	7,358.35	7,431.94	4,506.26	4,551.32	4,596.83
Deductions						
Pump Station 3 Demolition	0.00	0.00	300,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ending Cash Balance - June 30	735,835.33	743,193.68	450,625.62	455,131.88	459,683.20	464,280.03

Schedule Cumb 3-20 Debt Service Fund

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD Restricted Debt Service Account Balances					
Years ended thru September 30, thru 2018	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018
RICWFA Debt Stabilization Account					
Beginning Cash Balance	2,863,417.17	2,552,938.70	2,136,174.99	1,443,111.32	795,887.16
Total Additions - Rate Revenue & Interest Income	52,896.75	180.33		•	•
Total Deductions	363,375.22	416,944.04	693,063.67	647,224.16	386,639.15
Ending Cash Balance - Debt Stabllization	2,552,938.70	2,136,174.99	1,443,111.32	795,887.16	409,248.01
RICWFA Debt Service Account Bank of NY Account # 600582 GL Account # 305-0000-101.91-02					
Beginning Cash Balance	4,575,842.27	5,005,890.26	5,714,713.75	5,296,419.43	6,313,130.16
Total Additions	7,944,006.96	8,341,797.76	7,669,010.09	9,517,284.69	9,523,546.52
Total Deductions	7,513,958.97	7,632,974.27	8,087,304.41	8,500,573.96	8,773,980.85
Ending Cash Balance - Debt Service Account	5,005,890.26	5,714,713.75	5,296,419.43	6,313,130.16	7,062,695.83
Excess Funds in the Debt Service Account	363,252.02	687,195.72	NONE	681,913.87	1,342,758.22

Schedule CUMB 3-20 Revenue Allowance Account

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD
Revenue Stabilization/Operating Revenue Allowance

	J	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Beginning Cash Balance - July 1		619.31	619.31	619.31	294,993.31	589,367.31	883,741.31
Additions							
Restricted Rate Revenue		0.00	0.00	294,374.00	294,374.00	294,374.00	294,374.00
Investment income			•			•	•
Tota	Total Additions		1	294,374.00	294,374.00	294,374.00	294,374.00
Deductions							
	unknown	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ending Cash Balance - June 30	I	619.31	619.31	294,993.31	589,367.31	883,741.31	1,178,115.31

Note: These deposits are dependent upon PWSB realizing the full revenues authorized in Docket 4550.

Schedule CUMB 3-20 O&M Reserve

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD Trust Indenture O&M Reserve Account For the year ended June 30, 2014

	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19
Beginning Cash Balance - July 1	2,708,180.96	2,708,185.21	2,708,205.01	2,708,206.01	2,708,207.01	2,708,208.01
Additions						
From Rates - required revenue allocation	0.00	0.00	0.00	00.00	00.00	0.00
From Rates - excess revenue allocation	0.00	00.00	00.00	0.00	0.00	00.00
Investment income	4.25	19.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Total Additions	4.25	19.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Deductions						
Transfer excess revenue deposit to IFR	0.00	68,206.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ending Cash Balance - June 30	2,708,185.21	2,639,998.34	2,708,206.01	2,708,207.01	2,708,208.01	2,708,209.01

Cumb. 3-21: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-24] Again with respect to the funding of the IFR Fund, if the funding of that Fund was lowered to \$2.0 million per year (instead of \$2.5 million per year), but everything else was approved as proposed what specific impact(s) would that have in the short run (FY2016 through FY2018) on MR-10, CL-6, the other distribution improvements now planned for FY2018 (about \$600,000), and any other projects that PWSB is sure they can be started and completed before the end of FY2018? These "other projects" should be the same or nearly the same as the "other projects" that are provided in response to Cumb. 3-19.

Response:

Any reduction in the IFR funding level would extend the PWSB's capital improvement program, and would mean increased costs for projects. For example, the cost of projects such as tank painting, or dam and well rehabilitation, increases because the further a tank, dam or well deteriorates, the more it costs to rehabilitate. The longer the PWSB waits to replace aging equipment, the higher the cost and the PWSB will also be incurring costs to maintain the aging equipment. Any delays in the meter replacement program would have to be made up in out years in order to maintain the replacement schedule.

Prepared by: C. Woodcock

Set 3

Cumb. 3-22:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-25] Near the end of your response to Cumb. 1-25 you state, "The PWSB reviews these bonds for potential refinancing on a regular basis." Please provide the dates of the last 3 such reviews along with the interest rates available at the time of each review and a detailed explanation of why the bonds were not refinanced at those times. If such a review has not taken place in the last 12 months, why hasn't one taken place in that timeframe when interest rates were at or near all-time lows? Please provide detailed responses to each question.

Response:

The data is reviewed approximately once per year. Detailed results of each review are not retained, however the data for the inputs utilized in the analysis is available so the analysis can be replicated. The 2003 Bonds are taxable and are not eligible for the subsidized rates normally available through the RICWFA. Therefore, the interest rate is based on the US Treasury curve plus a credit spread. For example, in 2003, the 30 year US Treasury rate was 5.02% on the day of pricing and the 30 year rate on the bonds was 6.002%. In addition, the principal amortization was delayed to year 21 to wrap the taxable debt service around the 20 year State Revolving Fund loans to smooth out the debt service increase for the Water Treatment Plant. Following is a summary of hypothetical refunding results for recent years based upon Treasury rates and projected interest cost for refinancing the 2003 Bonds at those times:

Pawtucket Water Supply Board Refunding Opportunity Summary Market rates are for taxable 'A' rating May 29, 2015

Savings Summary	Revenue Refunding Bonds 2015	Revenue Refunding Bonds 2014	Revenue Refunding Bonds 2013	Revenue Refunding Bonds 2009
Date	May 2015	July 2014	September 2013	November 2009
US Treasury	2.990%	3.960%	3.860%	4.410%
TIC (Projected)	5.000%	5.190%	5.400%	6.090%
D/S Savings (Cost)	(452,350)	(1,757,378)	(2,672,716)	(17,099,766)
Annual D/S Savings (Cost)	Approx. (21,000)	Approx. (100,000)	Approx. (118,000)	Approx. (650,000)
All-in TIC	5.078%	5.078%	5.078%	5.000%
Net Present Value Savings (\$)	414,856	(7,071,130)	(757,979)	(119,283)
Net Present Value Savings (%)	1.537%	-26.194%	-2.808%	-0.442%

Most issuers seek a minimum of 3% Net Present Value Savings which would require a higher projected level prior to initiating a refunding bond issue to accommodate interest rate risk. None of the prior reviews

approached that level of savings.

Prepared by: Prepared under the Supervision of R. Benson with information from Maureen Gurghigian of First Southwest Company

Cumb. 3-23: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-31, 1-31a and 1-32] Why was the original loan lowered to \$5.907 million? Is it designed to cover the MR-10 project only, or that plus something else? How is it, as you state, that by reducing a bond issue by about 45% (\$4.7 million) from \$10.6 million to \$5.9 million (and at a lower interest rate) that a principal payment can increase by \$251,000? Furthermore, if the same term is used and the interest rate is lower, why aren't all Debt Service payments cut by about 50%? Please provide the amortization tables for two bond issues: one with the \$10.6 million principal with the term and interest rate used in the filing; and another with a principal of \$5.907 million using the same term as the \$10.6 million bond, and the interest rate that was used in the comparison provided in your response to Cumb. 1-32.

Response:

As set forth in the my direct testimony, the PWSB had originally planned to borrow \$10,600,000 from the RICWFA in the spring of 2015 to fund main replacement project MR-10 and cleaning and lining project CL-6. However, as set forth in my responses to Cumberland Data Requests 1-31(a) and 1-32, the CL-6 cleaning and lining project is not currently on the Rhode Island Department of Health Project ("RIDOH") Priority List and will not be eligible until Fiscal Year 2016. A project must be on the list to qualify for RICWFA borrowing. Thus, the PWSB cannot borrow funds from RICWFA for CL-6 until Fiscal Year 2016. As a result, the PWSB will only borrow \$5,907,000 in Fiscal Year 2015 for MR-10, and will borrow the remaining funds for CL-6 in Fiscal Year 2016.

As set forth in the debt service schedule for the \$10.6 million loan provided in the original filing, the initial principal payments were \$1,000 on September 1, 2015 and 2016. The schedule for the \$5.97 million borrowing shows that the principal payment on September 1, 2016 is \$251,000. This is because principal payments increase once the project is complete. Since the projects are now split into two borrowings, the increased principal payment on the MR-10 project is accelerated.

Cumberland has the debt service schedule for the \$10.6 million borrowing as it was provided as Schedule RB-3 in my original direct testimony. The revised debt service schedules for the MR-10 and CL-6 borrowings were provided in my Supplemental Direct Testimony as

Schedule RB-03 Revised. The interest rates and payment schedules are available on the original and revised RB-03 debt service schedules.

Set 3

Cumb. 3-24:

[Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-31, 1-31a and 1-32] In your response to Cumb. 1-32 you state that CL-6 will not be eligible for SRF funds until FY2016 and that because of this the bond for CL-6 will be delayed one year to FY2016. If it isn't eligible until FY2016, isn't it likely that the actual approval may not happen until well into FY2016 and that if that happens the closing date for the associated bonds could easily be delayed until late FY2016 or early FY2017? If you disagree, explain in detail why you disagree. You also indicate that the bond size for CL-6 is \$4.918 million. Have you factored in the current estimate for this project of just under \$3.6 million (see response to Cumb. 1-21)? If you have, please provide all assumptions, calculations and supporting documents used to derive that bond size. If you haven't factored in the lower cost estimate, please do so and provide the new bond size and associated amortization schedule.

Response:

The PWSB plans on contacting RIDOH before the end of calendar 2015 to ensure CL-6 is placed on the Project Priority List as an approved project so the loan is approved in the spring of 2016. This will ensure that we can award the contract for the 2016 construction season. In addition, we expect that 90% of the construction invoices will be paid in FY2017 and the balance paid in FY2018. The actual loan value to fund CL-6 is \$4.718 million. Please see the revised debt service schedules for the CL-6 borrowings, which were provided in my Supplemental Direct Testimony as Schedule RB-03 Revised. This schedule provides the calculations for the loan value and the debt service schedules. Finally, the estimate of \$3.6 million for this project set forth in the response to Cumb. 1-21 was inaccurate. Please see the PWSB's revised response to Cumb. 1-21.

Prepared by: R. Benson and J. DeCelles

Cumb. 3-25: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-31, 1-31a and 1-32] Based on the

new bond sizes and their timing; your responses to all Information requests to date related to these projects (MR-10 and CL-6) and their associated funding; and new information available to the PWSB since the filing date, What changes would you make to Schedules RB-02 and RB-3, and how would the levels of the proposed increases change

given those revisions?

Response: Please see my Supplemental Direct Testimony filed on May 28, 2015.

Cumb. 3-26: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-37] It is now the middle of May, please provide the update that was indicated in your response to Cumb. 1-37 in your response to this Information Request. Alternatively, if is not available at the time of your response, explain why it is not, and describe what needs to be done before it will be available along with a date certain when it will be available. Will the update include a final service fee amount charged in FY2015? If so, show all assumptions, calculations and analysis used to compute that amount. How is that amount reconciled with the Budget amount shown on RB-07?

Response:

Please see the attached Revised RB-07 which has been updated with the final service fee for FY15. That amount will be \$1,869,781. This schedule has also been updated to include a revised budget for the Rate Year and that amount is \$1,899,288. The revised RB-07 shows all calculations to arrive at this amount. This schedule has also been revised to use the most recent 5 year CPI average which is 2.02%. Therefore, the net change from the original filing for the DBO fee is a reduction \$182,996.

Pawtucket Water Supply Board

Water Treatment Facility Service Fee Analysis

Balances per PWSB Accounting Records

For year ending June 30, 2016

Service Fee Calculation

Mill Street WTP operations transferred to contractor on 2/15/04.

Branch Street WTP completed and placed in service 3/18/08.

Contract awarded to Earth Tech 9/10/03. Earth Tech acquired by AECOM effective July 28, 2008. Current contractor is UNITED WATER. United Water acquired operations division from AECOM effective 2010.

				Consumer Price	Index - All Urban	Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers: Northeast Urban	east Urban - Size C	- Size Class B/C (from US Departmen		of Labor website)				
Calculate Annual CPI Factor	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
Jan	113.1	116.0	119.4	124.8	127.237	133.3010	133.308	138.416	141.001	145.456	147.337	149.186		
Feb	113.8	116.6	120.1	125.2	127.546	133.5110	133.967	138.491	141.547	146.217	148.195	149.685		
Mar	115.0	117.4	121.3	126.0	128.691	134.6110	134.411	138.871	143.001	146.961	147.909	150.706		
Apr	114.4	118.1	122.0	127.3	129.563	135.7390	134.547	139.115	143.987	147.460	147.909	150.466		
May	114.2	118.3	121.6	127.4	130.488	136.9130	134.857	139.362	144.697	147.244	147.971	151.354		
nnr	113.9	118.7	121.8	127.7	130.893	138.5420	136.488	139.163	144.525	146.533	147.926	151.162		
lul	114.5	119.2	123.0	128.2	131.391	139.6230	136.417	139.274	144.952	146.456	148.223	151.359		
Aug	114.4	118.9	123.0	128.5	130.519	138.5370	136.598	139.348	145.339	146.885	148.802	150.633		
Sep	115.0	119.2	124.5	127.2	130.206	137.7230	136.691	139.229	145.369	147.846	148.683	150.559		
Oct	115.2	120.1	125.2	126.9	130.761	136.7300	137.348	139.746	145.404	148.210	148.483	150.333		
Nov	115.3	120.1	124.3	126.4	132.049	134.4450	137.646	140.282	145.335	147.246	148.420	149.150		
Dec	115.0	119.2	123.6	126.7	132.323	132.8300	137.597	140.351	145.062	147.004	148.367	148.240		
	1373.8	1421.8	1469.8	1522.3	1561.7	1632.5	1629.9	1671.6	1730.2	1763.5	1778.2	1802.8	0.0	Average
Calculate CPI Adjustment %														Last 5 Yrs
Current Year End CPI factor	1,373.80	1,421.80	1,469.80	1,522.30	1,561.70	1,632.50	1,629.90	1,671.60	1,730.20	1,763.50	1,778.20	1,802.80		1,749.26
Prior Year End CPI factor	,	1,373.80	1,421.80	1,469.80	1,522.30	1,561.70	1,632.50	1,629.90	1,671.60	1,730.20	1,763.50	1,778.20		1,714.68
CPI adjustment		48.00	48.00	52.50	39.40	70.80	(2.60)	41.70	58.60	33.30	14.70	24.60		34.58
CPI Adjustment %		3.49%	3.38%	3.57%	2.59%	4.53%	-0.16%	7.60%	3.50%	1.90%	0.80%	1.40%		2.02%
		1	1	1	1	П	⊣	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.00
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13	
Calculate Annual Service Fee - Option B	New Treatment	Facility)											FY16 Budget	
Current Service Fee 1,429,4		1,429,458.20	1,479,346.29	1,529,348.20	1,583,945.93	1,624,970.13	1,698,581.28	1,695,863.55	1,739,955.97	1,800,854.40	1,835,070.63	1,849,751.23	1,875,647.75	
CPI Adjustment %		3.49%	3.38%	3.57%	2.59%	4.53%	-0.16%	2.60%	3.50%	1.90%	0.80%	1.40%	2.02%	ave CPI adjust
Service Fee increase	,	49,888.09	50,001.90	54,597.73	41,024.20	73,611.15	(2,717.73)	44,092.45	60,898.46	34,216.23	14,680.57	25,896.52	37,888.08	
New Annual Service Fee		1,479,346.29	1,529,348.19	1,583,945.93	1,624,970.13	1,698,581.28	1,695,863.55	1,739,956.00	1,800,854.43	1,835,070.66	1,849,751.23	1,875,647.75	1,913,535.83	
Number of months		12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	
New Monthly Service Fee	' '	123,278.86	127,445.68	131,995.49	135,414.18	141,548.44	141,321.96	144,996.33	150,071.20	152,922.56	154,145.94	156,303.98	159,461.32	
Pass Through Costs														
Annual Performance Bond (annual term effective 2/15)	ctive 2/15)	15,800.00	15,800.00	15,800.00	15,800.00	15,800.00	15,800.00	17,154.00	12,217.00	12,430.00	12,521.00	12,682.00	12,845.00	
Number of months	,	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	
Monthly Amount Pass Through Costs		1,316.67	1,316.67	1,316.67	1,316.67	1,316.67	1,316.67	1,429.50	1,018.08	1,035.84	1,043.42	1,056.83	1,070.42	
Monthly Invoice Amount		124,595.53	128,762.35	133,312.16	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81	160,531.74	

Water Treatment Facility Service Fee Analysis **Balances per PWSB Accounting Records** Pawtucket Water Supply Board

For year ending June 30, 2016

Service Fee Calculation

Mill Street WTP operations transferred to contractor on 2/15/04.

Branch Street WTP completed and placed in service 3/18/08.

Contract awarded to Earth Tech 9/10/03. Earth Tech acquired by AECOM effective July 28, 2008. Current contractor is UNITED WATER. United Water acquired operations division from AECOM effective 2010.

Year 13

		FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16 Budget
Balance per general ledger for the	2004	2002	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
BUDGET	none	1,170,576	1,200,000	1,500,000	1,513,345	1,662,647	1,733,893	1,733,893	1,770,284	1,827,143	1,861,340	1,869,781	\$ 1,899,288
FY09 expenditures paid in FY2010							294,436.92						
lut	na	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81
Aug	na	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81
Sep	na	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.62	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81
Oct	na	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81
Nov	na	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81
Dec	na	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81
Jan	na	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81
Adjust Performance Bond Premium		200	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	7	, , ,							, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	7
retroactive increase to 2/15		1,489.39	1,514.20	1,644.12	1,235.38						1,039.63	1,049.65	1,063.14
Feb	47,871.00	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,097.53	152,922.56	154,145.94	156,303.98
subtotals- FY14 per GL as of 5/31/14	47,871.00	767,425.39	791,280.44	815,637.64	841,606.02	1,093,846.80	1,437,357.80	1,141,109.03	1,171,406.64	1,208,722.49	1,231,670.99	1,241,521.11	1,258,892.79
Mar	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	101,749.19	107,517.09	136,730.85	142,638.63	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	158,800.30
retroactive increase for March				3,288.25		2,572.40	131.51	2,347.10	1,668.28	1,305.47	563.48	988.00	
Apr	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	136,730.85	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81	160,531.74
retroactive increase for April						6,134.26							
May	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81	160,531.74
unſ	95,742.00	98,720.78	101,749.19	105,046.33	136,730.85	142,865.11	142,638.63	146,425.83	151,089.28	153,958.40	155,189.36	157,360.81	160,531.74
reclass FY09 payables	1	ı		-	-		(294,436.88)	•		•		•	1
GL Account 300-9550-652.30-40	430,839.00	1,162,308.51	1,198,277.20	1,235,814.07	1,359,315.66	1,661,745.38	1,713,606.95	1,725,372.25	1,772,768.59	1,822,992.44	1,851,760.95	1,869,780.90	1,899,288.31
Kelmburseme	Kelmbursement of prior year unexpended WTF major	expended W I F ma	ıjor repair & repiac	repair & replacement fund included in DBO costs	sed in UBO costs	(260,013.00)							

1,401,732.38

Cumb. 3-27: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-38] Given your response to Cumb. 1-38 relative to discarding an outlier that occurred in calendar 2009 wouldn't you also agree that if the older 5 years of a 10 year average are uniformly higher than the more recent 5 years, then for planning purposes, a better estimate of how that indicator will likely perform in the short term future, should at least place less emphasis on the older data? If you disagree, please explain in detail your reasons for disagreeing. If the CPI increase in calendar 2014 approximates the increases in 2012 and 2013, wouldn't it be more appropriate or reasonable to base the CPI increase that is used to estimate the FY2016 service fee on an average of the CPI changes from calendar 2012 through 2014? If you disagree, please explain in detail your reason(s) for disagreeing.

Response: Please see the response to Cumb. 3-26. The CPI increase has been revised

to the most recent 5 year average.

Cumb. 3-28: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-40] Please provide the monthly

consumption data for April of this year in the same format as the information that was provided in response to Division data requests 1-9 and 1-10. Also provide the same consumption information for the month of May as soon as it is available. As part of your response to this information request provide the earliest date in June when the

May data should be available.

Response: Please see the updated schedule that includes the consumption

information billed in the month of May. The June consumption data will not be available until the billing process is complete which is

expected to be on June 30, 2015.

Size
Meter
à
tion
ımptic
unsuc
S
Monthly
WSB I

% of Docket	% of Docket	1																	
FY12	FY12	1,812,676,224	43,998,753	109,138,065	1,965,813,042	83,046,581	359,475,516	442,522,097	89,655,296	32,470,532	69,670,553	191,796,382	2,600,131,521	0	160,842,248	160,842,248	2,760,973,769		7,564,312 89.9%
Jun-12	Jun-12	164,881,240	3,977,648	10,009,578	178,868,466	7,264,051	30,979,569	38,243,620	7,455,565	2,056,527	5,937,670	15,449,761	232,561,847	0	17,155,429	17,155,429	249,717,276	2,760,973,769	
May-12	May-12	140,829,825	3,408,344	8,364,506	152,602,675	6,313,964	27,068,502	33,382,466	6,685,770	2,732,061	4,185,620	13,603,450	199,588,591	0	9,025,827	9,025,827	208,614,418	2,511,256,493	
Apr-12	Apr-12	140,653,273	3,370,191	8,312,139	152,335,603	6,695,495	32,506,441	39,201,936	6,486,775	1,766,264	4,790,084	13,043,124	204,580,663	0	4,175,146	4,175,146	208,755,809	2,302,642,075	
Mar-12	Mar-12	127,107,427	3,441,260	7,810,164	138,358,851	5,999,762	26,206,691	32,206,453	6,246,635	1,343,588	4,490,844	12,081,067	182,646,371	0	2,764,230	2,764,230	185,410,600	2,093,886,266	
Feb-12	Feb-12	129,392,872	2,941,529	8,012,899	140,347,301	5,999,762	25,855,832	31,855,594	5,914,479	1,767,012	6,500,241	14,181,732	186,384,626	0	5,336,197	5,336,197	191,720,824	1,908,475,666	
Jan-12	Jan-12	147,111,621	3,257,227	8,618,112	158,986,960	6,613,204	27,471,728	34,084,932	6,013,976	1,715,393	5,658,628	13,387,998	206,459,890	0	1,112,425	1,112,425	207,572,315	1,716,754,842	
Dec-11	Dec-11	135,614,072	3,156,982	8,035,342	146,806,396	6,246,635	29,335,245	35,581,880	6,327,430	2,319,858	6,385,782	15,033,070	197,421,346	0	4,091,359	4,091,359	201,512,705	1,509,182,527	
Nov-11	Nov-11	134,542,045	3,222,067	8,184,214	145,948,325	6,284,040	26,693,704	32,977,744	6,358,850	2,560,746	6,236,162	15,155,758	194,081,827	0	3,869,173	3,869,173	197,951,001	1,307,669,823	
Oct-11	Oct-11	160,341,021	4,006,076	11,035,223	175,382,320	7,832,607	31,722,432	39,555,039	13,080,529	3,971,663	6,696,991	23,749,183	238,686,542	0	10,294,604	10,294,604	248,981,146	1,109,718,822	
Sep-11	Sep-11	141,520,321	3,869,921	8,671,227	154,061,470	6,403,736	27,143,312	33,547,048	7,304,448	3,120,325	5,137,203	15,561,976	203,170,494	0	17,216,025	17,216,025	220,386,520	860,737,677	
Aug-11	Aug-11	220,419,436	5,333,953	12,127,449	237,880,838	9,530,794	42,314,032	51,844,826	10,204,084	5,811,241	7,346,342	23,361,667	313,087,331	0	47,113,094	47,113,094	360,200,425	640,351,157	
Jul-11	Jul-11	0 170,263,071	4,013,557	9,957,211	184,233,839	7,862,531	32,178,025	40,040,556	7,576,757	3,305,854	6,304,987	17,187,598	241,461,993	0	38,688,740	38,688,740		280,150,732	
Docket 4171	Docket 4171	0	0	0	Small 1,996,829,268 184,233,839	0	0	464,807,996	0	0	0	183,238,118	2,644,875,382	0	0	425,802,062	3,070,677,444 280,150,732		Read Date Prior Read Date # of Days 8,412,815 AVE MGD YTD
Meter Size	Meter Size	2/8	3/4	1	Small	11/2	2	Medium	3	4	9	Large	Retail	8	12	Whise	Totals		MGD

RETAIL

WHOLESALE

-			1																									
	% of Docket	% of Docket																										
	FY13	FY13	1,783,201,832	42,961,887	112,409,506	1,938,573,225	84,254,014	372,547,815	456,801,830	55,406,530	25,075,564	56,097,775	136,579,869	2,531,954,923	0	152,837,578	152,837,578	2,684,792,502	87.4%				364	7,355,596 87.4%				
	Jun-13	Jun-13	170,376,783	3,975,403	10,555,691	184,907,877	8,124,366	34,644,511	42,768,877	5,262,135	2,080,466	4,069,664	11,412,266	239,089,020	0	21,771,206	21,771,206	260,860,226	2,684,792,502	100.0%	6/3/2013	5/1/2013	33	7,904,855	7,375,804	87.7%	2,531,954,923	152,837,578
	May-13	May-13	134,437,311	3,156,234	8,423,606	146,017,150	6,456,103	28,674,673	35,130,776	3,918,548	1,919,625	4,033,007	9,871,180	191,019,106	0	9,662,460	9,662,460	200,681,566	2,423,932,276	90.3%	5/1/2013	4/1/2013	30	6,689,386	7,323,058	82.0%	2,292,865,904	131,066,372
	Apr-13	Apr-13	136,329,255	3,105,363	8,378,720	147,813,339	6,500,989	29,377,887	35,878,876	2,623,587	1,231,373	3,601,353	7,456,313	191,148,527	0	4,079,389	4,079,389	195,227,917	2,223,250,710	82.8%	4/1/2013	3/1/2013	31	6,297,675	7,386,215	81.8%	2,101,846,798	121,403,912
	Mar-13	Mar-13	122,830,539	2,862,979	7,847,569	133,541,087	6,059,610	26,372,021	32,431,631	3,299,869	1,010,683	3,011,851	7,322,403	173,295,121	0	3,460,711	3,460,711	176,755,831	2,028,022,794	75.5%	3/1/2013	2/1/2013	28	6,312,708	7,511,196	89.3%	1,910,698,271	117.324.523
	Feb-13	Feb-13	133,088,486	3,234,784	8,528,340	144,851,611	6,343,888	29,565,660	35,909,548	4,035,251	1,862,021	6,040,159	11,937,432	192,698,590	0	12,946,619	12,946,619	205,645,209	1,851,266,963	%0.69	2/1/2013	1/2/2013	30	6,854,840	7,649,863	%6:06	1,737,403,150	113,863,812
	Jan-13	Jan-13	132,170,568	3,037,286	7,982,227	143,190,081	6,523,432	27,172,488	33,695,920	3,673,919	1,192,471	4,018,793	8,885,184	185,771,184	0	927,644	927,644	186,698,828	1,645,621,754	61.3%	1/2/2013	12/3/2012	30	6,223,294	7,762,367	92.3%	1,544,704,560	100.917.194
	Dec-12	Dec-12	143,470,618	3,384,404	8,655,517	155,510,539	6,456,851	31,503,987	37,960,838	4,092,107	2,251,781	6,263,093	12,606,981	206,078,359	0	4,113,802	4,113,802	210,192,161	1,458,922,925	54.3%	12/3/2012	11/1/2012	32	6,568,505	8,016,060	95.3%	1,358,933,375	99,989,550
	Nov-12	Nov-12	142,117,305	3,563,948	968,960,6	154,778,150	6,516,699	31,204,747	37,721,446	4,674,129	1,273,266	5,506,016	11,453,411	203,953,007	0	2,901,132	2,901,132	206,854,139	1,248,730,764	46.5%	11/1/2012	10/1/2012	31	6,672,714	8,324,872	%0.66	1,152,855,016	95.875.748
	Oct-12	Oct-12	135,550,483	3,604,346	9,478,427	148,633,256	7,497,458	29,828,243	37,325,701	4,690,587	1,675,744	4,776,619	11,142,950	197,101,907	0	9,085,675	9,085,675	206,187,582	1,041,876,626	38.8%	10/1/2012	9/4/2012	27	7,636,577	8,755,266	104.1%	948,902,010	92,974,616
	Sep-12	Sep-12	192,697,094	4,911,277	12,620,447	210,228,818	8,767,732	41,708,071	50,475,803	6,598,990	4,000,839	4,808,787	15,408,616	276,113,237	0	29,041,990	29,041,990	305,155,227	835,689,044	31.1%	9/4/2012	8/1/2012	34	8,975,154	9,083,577	108.0%	751,800,103	83,888,942
	Aug-12	Aug-12	183,292,729	4,348,705	11,595,550	199,236,984	7,840,088	34,423,073	42,263,161	6,133,672	4,222,276	5,713,988	16,069,936	257,570,082	0	33,004,676	33,004,676	290,574,758	530,533,818	19.8%	8/1/2012	7/2/2012	30	9,685,825	9,147,135	108.7%	475,686,866	54,846,952
	Jul-12	Jul-12	156,840,661	3,777,157	9,246,516	169,864,334	7,166,798	28,072,453	35,239,251	6,403,736	2,355,019	4,254,445	13,013,200	218,116,784	0	21,842,276	21,842,276	239,959,060	239,959,060	8.9%	7/2/2012	6/4/2012	28	8,569,966	8,569,966	101.9%	218,116,784	21.842.276
	Docket 4171	Docket 4171	0	0	0	1,996,829,268	0	0	464,807,996	0	0	0	183,238,118	2,644,875,382	0	0	425,802,062	3,070,677,444			Read Date	Prior Read Date	# of Days	8,412,815 AVE MGD YTD			RETAIL	WHOLESALE
	eter Size	ster Size		1		Small	/2		Medium				Large	Retail			Whise	tals			_	4		MGD /				_

PWSB Monthly Consumption

% of	% of		0	5	8	2	2	6	1	-	2	3	6	2	0	4	4	6 88.39%		0				9	%			
7 7 7	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		1,761,248,090	43,096,545	115,790,918	1,920,135,552	84,637,042	383,917,439	468,554,481	63,493,491	45,403,685	40,282,193	149,179,369	2,537,869,402	-	176,160,344	176,160,344	2,714,029,746		, 620,143,480			364	7,456,126	88.6%			
Ins. 42	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ti-lino	155,216,536	3,775,661	10,301,337	169,293,534	7,316,418	34,150,765	41,467,183	7,198,218	4,303,819	5,086,332	16,588,369	227,349,086	0	14,142,831	14,142,831	241,491,917	2,714,029,746	100.0%	6/2/2014	5/1/2014	32	7,546,622	7,456,126	2 527 950 402	5,914,479	176,160,344
Mox 44	May-14	ınay-ı+	132,287,271	3,232,540	8,887,428	144,407,239	6,486,027	28,517,572	35,003,599	4,831,978	3,423,306	3,439,016	11,694,299	191,105,137	0	3,286,403	3,286,403	194,391,541	2,472,537,829	91.1%	5/1/2014	4/1/2014	30	6,479,718	7,447,403	2 240 520 246	17,654,412	162,017,513
Ans 4.4	Apr. 44	41-14v	126,660,811	3,217,578	8,423,606	138,301,995	6,336,407	28,046,269	34,382,676	4,117,542	3,014,843	2,737,298	9,869,683	182,554,354	0	1,234,365	1,234,365	183,788,719	2,278,146,288	83.9%	4/1/2014	3/3/2014	29	6,337,542	7,543,531	2 440 445 470	17,568,380	158,731,110
Mor 44	T T T	Mai-14	121,876,712	3,044,767	7,959,784	132,881,263	5,947,395	27,208,397	33,155,792	4,372,645	2,642,289	3,195,883	10,210,817	176,247,871	0	6,786,763	6,786,763	183,034,635	2,094,357,569	77.2%	3/3/2014	2/3/2014	28	6,536,951	7,671,639	1 026 060 024	26,162,553	157,496,745
7 40	4 7	+1-02-1	143,341,197	3,608,086	9,351,250	156,300,533	6,860,077	34,420,081	41,280,158	4,885,841	3,101,623	3,134,539	11,122,003	208,702,694	0	14,474,239	14,474,239	223,176,933	1,911,322,934	70.4%	2/3/2014	1/2/2014	32	6,974,279	7,801,318	1 750 613 053	23,209,803	150,709,982
14 ac	41 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 1	Jail-14	138,958,079	3,251,991	8,962,238	151,172,308	6,321,445	28,981,394	35,302,839	4,329,255	3,040,278	3,907,326	11,276,859	197,752,006	0	7,210,936	7,210,936	204,962,942	1,688,146,002	62.2%	1/2/2014	12/2/2013	31	6,611,708	7,925,568	4 554 040 250	7,205,699	136,235,743
Dec 43	2 20	000-13	139,949,311	3,421,809	8,917,352	152,288,473	6,359,598	33,028,615	39,388,213	4,430,996	3,001,377	3,319,320	10,751,693	202,428,379	0	6,965,559	6,965,559	209,393,938	1,483,183,060	24.6%	12/2/2013	11/1/2013	31	6,754,643	8,149,357	4 264 460 262	(4,775,122)	129,024,807
Nov. 43	NOV. 13	CI-AON	145,250,348	3,836,257	9,897,363	158,983,968	6,869,054	31,607,225	38,476,279	5,205,280	3,522,055	4,350,202	13,077,536	210,537,783	0	9,485,160	9,485,160	220,022,943	1,273,789,122	46.9%	11/1/2013	10/1/2013	31	7,097,514	8,435,690	1 151 720 074	(1,125,142)	122,059,248
004 43	00-1-1	61-100	141,663,957	3,530,284	9,882,401	155,076,641	7,230,387	31,539,896	38,770,283	5,622,720	3,583,399	3,536,269	12,742,387	206,589,311	0	23,018,289	23,018,289	229,607,600	1,053,766,179	38.8%	10/1/2013	9/3/2013	28	8,200,271	8,781,385	944 402 004	(7,709,919)	112,574,088
Con 43	0 cep-13	CI-dao	184,695,417	4,562,662	12,194,030	201,452,109	8,504,401	38,736,618	47,241,019	6,715,694	5,257,647	2,616,854	14,590,194	263,283,322	0	34,498,632	34,498,632	297,781,953	824,158,579	30.4%	9/3/2013	8/1/2013	33	9,023,696	8,958,245	72.4 602 700	(17,197,323)	89,555,799
A. 12	Aug-15	Aug-13	184,185,961	4,181,879	11,490,816	199,858,656	9,403,617	35,295,358	44,698,975	6,483,035	5,116,256	3,133,791	14,733,081	259,290,712	0	39,071,767	39,071,767	298,362,479	526,376,626	19.4%	80	7/1/2013	31	9,624,596	8,921,638	474 240 450	(4,367,408)	55,057,168
111 43	Jul 2	CILIDO	147,162,492	3,433,031	9,523,313	160,118,835	7,002,216	32,385,249	39,387,465	5,300,289	5,396,793	1,825,364	12,522,446	212,028,746	0	15,985,401	15,985,401	228,014,147	228,014,147	8.4%	7/1/2013	6/3/2013	28	8,143,362		24.2 000 746	(6,088,038)	15,985,401
Dooloot 4474		DOCKEL 4171	0	0	0	1,996,829,268	0	0	464,807,996	0	0	0	183,238,118	2,644,875,382	0	0	425,802,062	3,070,677,444			Read Date	Prior Read Date	# of Days	8,412,815	AVE MGD YTD	PETAI		WHOLESALE
Motor Circ	Meter Size	Metel 3126	5/8	3/4	1	Small	11/2	2	Medium	3	4	6	Large	Retail	8	12	Whise	Totals				-		MGD				

PWSB Monthly Consumption

% of Docket	% of Docket				75.89%			18.96%				5.15%	100.0%				82.29%							
FY15	FY15	1,625,441,008	39,344,075	110,240,016	1,775,025,099	80,327,986	363,135,221	443,463,207	56,052,141	40,876,932	23,508,294	120,437,367	2,338,925,673	0	187,883,071	187,883,071	2,526,808,744			333	7,588,014 90.2%			
Jun-15	Jun-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,526,808,744	5/1/2015		7,588,014	2,338,925,673	(0-1,0-0,0-1)	187,883,071 11,722,727
May-15	May-15	131,579,569	3,115,088	8,805,137	143,499,794	6,869,054	29,774,380	36,643,434	3,863,188	3,210,097	471,303	7,544,589	187,687,817	0	15,707,856	15,707,856	203,395,672	2,526,808,744 2,526,808,744	5/1/2015 4/2/2015	29	7,013,644 7,588,014	2,338,925,673	1.23%	187,883,071 25,865,558 15.96%
Apr-15	Apr-15	130,712,521	3,139,776	9,014,605	142,866,901	6,613,204	31,794,250	38,407,454	3,745,737	2,603,388	119,696	6,468,821	187,743,176	0	6,159,855	6,159,855	193,903,031	2,323,413,071	4/2/2015 3/2/2015	31	6,254,936 7,642,806	2,151,237,856	1.50%	172,175,215 13,444,105 8.47%
Mar-15	Mar-15	123,643,724	2,917,590	8,333,834	134,895,148	6,912,444	29,707,051	36,619,495	3,615,567	2,851,009	37,405	6,503,981	178,018,624	0	4,155,696	4,155,696	182,174,320	2,129,510,040	3/2/2015 2/2/2015	28	6,506,226 7,800,403	1,963,494,680	1.38%	166,015,360 8,518,615 5.41%
Feb-15	Feb-15	138,049,137	3,390,389	8,999,643	150,439,170	7,211,684	31,517,453	38,729,137	4,594,830	2,555,510	22,443	7,172,783	196,341,089	0	3,676,912	3,676,912	200,018,001	1,947,335,720	2/2/2015 1/2/2015	31	6,452,194 7,948,309	1,785,476,056	1.41%	161,859,664 11,149,682 7.40%
Jan-15	Jan-15	139,202,708	3,284,159	8,939,795	151,426,662	6,815,191	30,470,113	37,285,304	4,481,867	3,311,091	2,146,299	9,939,257	198,651,222	0	4,644,953	4,644,953	203,296,175	1,747,317,719	1/2/2015	32	6,353,005 8,165,036	1,589,134,967	2.40%	158,182,753 21,947,010 16.11%
Dec-14	Dec-14	138,458,348	3,195,883	9,104,377	150,758,608	6,755,343	30,589,809	37,345,152	4,876,864	3,385,153	5,550,902	13,812,918	201,916,679	0	3,598,361	3,598,361	205,515,040	1,544,021,544	12/1/2014	28	7,339,823 8,483,635	1,390,483,745	2.68%	153,537,800 24,512,993 19.00%
Nov-14	Nov-14	137,295,801	3,510,085	9,852,477	150,658,363	7,086,003	33,185,716	40,271,719	5,471,603	3,548,986	685,260	9,705,849	200,635,931	0	7,851,310	7,851,310	208,487,241	1,338,506,505	11/3/2014	33	6,317,795 8,691,601	1,188,567,066	3.20%	149,939,439 27,880,191 22.84%
Oct-14	Oct-14	155,580,861	3,937,250	11,161,652	170,679,763	7,738,346	36,230,483	43,968,829	6,379,049	4,142,978	3,196,631	13,718,658	228,367,250	0	26,483,488	26,483,488	254,850,738	1,130,019,264	10/1/2014 9/2/2014	29	8,787,956 9,339,002	987,931,135	4.97%	142,088,129 29,514,041 26.22%
Sep-14	Sep-14	180,625,005	4,649,442	13,331,142	198,605,588	8,600,158	38,818,909	47,419,067	6,166,588	5,878,570	3,480,161	15,525,319	261,549,974	0	34,383,424	34,383,424	295,933,398	875,168,526	9/2/2014 8/1/2014	32	9,247,919 9,512,701	759,563,884	3.40%	115,604,641 26,048,842 29.09%
Aug-14	Aug-14	184,449,292	4,406,309	12,253,878	201,109,479	8,372,735	38,115,695	46,488,430	7,189,989	5,550,154	3,457,718	16,197,861	263,795,770	0	43,469,099	43,469,099	307,264,869	579,235,128	8/1/2014 7/1/2014	31	9,911,770 9,653,919	498,013,911		81,221,217 26,164,049 47.52%
Jul-14	Jul-14	165,844,045	3,798,104	10,443,476	180,085,624	7,353,823	32,931,362	40,285,185	5,666,858	3,839,997	4,340,476	13,847,331	234,218,140	0	37,752,118	37,752,118	271,970,259	271,970,259	7/1/2014 6/2/2014	29	9,378,285	234,218,140	10.47%	37,752,118 21,766,718 136.17%
Meter Size Docket 4171	Docket 4171	0	0	0	1,996,829,268	0	0	464,807,996	0	0	0	183,238,118	2,644,875,382	0	0	425,802,062	3,070,677,444		Read Date Prior Read Date	# of Days	8,412,815 AVE MGD YTD	RETAIL		WHOLESALE
Meter Size	Meter Size	2/8	3/4	1	Small	11/2	2	Medium	3	4	9	Large	Retail	8	12	Whise	Totals			!	MGD			

printed: 5/26/2015 10:10 AM

Cumb. 3-29: [Ref. – PWSB response to Cumb. 1-42] Given the correction on Sch. RB-08

that you agreed with in your response to Cumb. 1-42, would you also agree that instead of showing a decrease in total billed consumption of (-14%) in FY2014, the correct number is an increase in total billed

consumption of +1% in FY2014?

Response: Yes I agree, the % decrease for FY2014 should have been an increase and

it should be an increase of 0.09%.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on June 5, 2015, I sent a copy of the within to all parties set forth on the attached Service List by electronic mail and copies to Luly Massaro, Commission Clerk, by electronic mail and regular mail.

Parties/Address	E-mail Distribution	Phone
Joseph A. Keough, Jr., Esq.	jkeoughjr@keoughsweeney.com	401-724-3600
Keough & Sweeney		
41 Mendon Ave.		
Pawtucket, RI 02861		
James L. DeCelles, P.E. Chief Engineer	decelles@pwsb.org	401-729-5001
Pawtucket Water Supply Board		
85 Branch St.	rbenson@pwsb.org	
Pawtucket, RI 02860		
Karen Lyons, Esq.	Klyons@riag.ri.gov	401-222-2424
Dept. of Attorney General	steve.scialabba@dpuc.ri.gov	
150 South Main St.	john.bell@dpuc.ri.gov	
Providence, RI 02903	Al.mancini@dpuc.ri.gov	
	Pat.smith@dpuc.ri.gov	
	Jmunoz@riag.ri.gov	
	dmacrae@riag.ri.gov	
Christopher Woodcock	Woodcock@w-a.com	508-393-3337
Woodcock & Associates, Inc.		
18 Increase Ward Drive		
Northborough, MA 01532		
David Bebyn	dbebyn@beconsulting.biz	401-785-0800
B&E Consulting		
21 Dryden Lane		
Providence, RI 02904		
Thomas S. Catlin	tcatlin@exeterassociates.com	410-992-7500
Exeter Associates, Inc.	jmierzwa@exeterassociates.com	
10480 Little Patuxent Parkway	Imorgan@exeterassociates.com	-
Suite 300	into igante execter associates.com	
Columbia, MD 21044		

Michael McElroy, Esquire	Michael@McElroyLawOffice.com	401-351-4100
Schacht & McElroy		
PO Box 6721		
Providence, RI 02940-6721		
Thomas Hefner, Esquire	thefner@cumberlandri.org	
Town of Cumberland		
David Russell	<u>Davidrussell015@comcast.net</u>	
File original and nine (9) copies w/:	Luly.massaro@puc.ri.gov	401-780-2104
Luly E. Massaro, Commission Clerk	Amy dalossandro@nus ri gov	401-941-1691
Public Utilities Commission	Amy.dalessandro@puc.ri.gov	
89 Jefferson Boulevard	Sharon.colbycamara@puc.ri.gov	
Warwick, RI 02888		

Joseph A. Keough, Jr., Esquire # 4925

Jougnallyn Ja

KEOUGH & SWEENEY, LTD.

41 Mendon Avenue Pawtucket, RI 02861

(401) 724-3600 (phone)

(401) 724-9909 (fax)

jkeoughjr@keoughsweeney.com