KEOUGH & SWEENEY, LTD.

ATTORNEYS AND GOUNSELORS AT LAW 100 ARMISTICE BOULEVARD PAWTUCKET, RHODE ISLAND 02860

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

SEAN P. KEOUGH*
MARGARET HOGAN SWEENEY*

JEROME V. SWEENEY II OF GOUNSEL

*Admitted to Practice in Rhode Island & Massachusetts TELEPHONE (401) 724-3600 FACSIMILE (401) 724-9909

www.keoughsweeney.com

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

2007 APR 19 AM 9:18

April 16, 2007

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

Re: City of Newport, Utilities Department, Water Department - Docket 3818

Dear Ms. Massaro:

Enclosed please find the following documents:

1) Newport Water's Response to the United States Navy's Data Requests, Set 2.

Please note that these Responses were provided electronically to the parties on the Service List on April 16, 2007.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. Keough, Jr.

JAK/kf Enclosures

Navy 2-1: Referencing Ms. Julia Forgue testimony page 5, line 11-14, please describe in more detail the "struggles" outlined in your rebuttal testimony in Docket 3578. What efforts have been taken "to correct the problems mentioned" and what "effects of the past" is Newport Water Company (NWC) still dealing with?

Response: The "struggles" refer to the difficulties currently experienced due in large part to past management of the Newport Water Division being unwilling or unable to request rate increases before the PUC to recover operating and capital expenses necessary to operate the Newport Water system.

The Newport Water Division is working with the Finance Department for the City of Newport to correct the financial issues in order to stabilize the utility. We believe our efforts are evident with our filings beginning with Docket 3578.

Prepared by: Julia Forgue

Navy 2-2: Please explain on what basis the Director of Administrative Services recommends test year Gas/Vehicle expense be raised by 15%. Ms Forgue testimony page 20, lines 26-27.

Response: Please see the response to Division 1-16.

Prepared by: Laura Sitrin

Navy 2-3: Please explain if the Gas/Vehicle maintenance is no longer being done inhouse, does this mean employee expense accounts decreased correspondingly and fully accounted for.

Response: Salary and benefit costs in the Equipment Operations Fund have been reduced to reflect lower staffing.

Prepared by: Laura Sitrin

Navy 2-4: Please provide a listing and description of Workman's Compensation claims for the last seven years.

Response: The description of Worker's Compensation Claims in the Water Division for the last seven years is attached.

Prepared by: Julia Forgue

FY 1999/2000

Job Title	Date of Injury	Injury
Laborer	7/26/1999	Contact with poisonous vegetation
Laborer	7/27/1999	Struck by flying object
Skilled LEO	8/8/1999	Exertion - lifting
Maintenance Helper	8/20/1999	Exertion - lifting
Plant Operator	8/22/1999	Exertion - lifting
Heavy Equipment Operator	9/9/1999	Exertion - repetitive motion
Plant Operator	9/9/1999	Slip,trip,fall-pits,shafts,holes
Light Equipment Operator	10/4/1999	Slip,trip,fall-pits,shafts,holes
Laborer	10/22/1999	Exertion - pulling or pushing
Plant Operator	11/29/1999	Struck by object being lifted or handled
Plant Operator	1/23/2000	Slip, trip or fall - elevated surfaces
Maintenance Mechanic	2/11/2000	Slip, trip or fall - same level
Skilled LEO	5/1/2000	Struck by object being lifted or handled
Maintenance Mechanic	6/15/2000	Exertion - using tool or machine
Clerk	6/26/2000	Exertion - repetitive motion

FY 2000/2001

Job Title	Date of Injury	Injury
Clerk	6/26/2000	left wrist
Laborer	7/6/2000	lower back
Laborer	8/21/2000	left eye
Maintenance Foreman	8/23/2000	lower back
Skilled LEO	9/12/2000	left thumb
Water Meter Repair	9/20/2000	left calf
Skilled LEO	10/3/2000	neck & shoulder
Laborer	10/19/2000	head & temple
Plant Operator	10/25/2000	left shin
Parts&Inventory Clerk	10/26/2000	right thumb
Maintenance Mechanic	1/4/2001	left shoulder
Skilled LEO	1/29/2001	left knee & foot
Meter Reader	4/3/2001	groin
Plant Operator	4/17/2001	right finger
Skilled LEO	5/21/2001	lower back

FY 2001/2002

Job Title	Date of Injury	Injury
Laborer Equipment Operator	7/1/2001	lower back
Water Meter Repair	7/16/2001	left elbow
Skilled LEO	8/2/2001	right knee
Laborer Equipment Operator	8/2/2001	left knee
Skilled LEO	8/6/2001	lower back
Maintenance Mechanic	8/8/2001	left knee
Plant Operator	9/17/2001	left finger
Meter Reader	12/11/2001	dog bite
Maintenance Mechanic	1/16/2002	left shoulder
Skilled LEO	3/21/2002	forehead
Water Meter Repair	4/1/2002	lower back
Skilled LEO	6/27/2002	bruised ribs

FY 2002/2003

	Job Title	Date of Injury	Injury
[5	Skilled LEO	12/5/2002	left middle finger
V	Nater Meter Repair	1/29/2003	lower back
Ī	Maintenance Mechanic	3/18/2003	left wrist

FY 2003/2004

Job Title	Date of Injury	Injury
Maintenance Mechanic	10/30/2003	Left finger
Maintenance Mechanic	12/29/2003	rib & right side of body
Maintenance Mechanic	1/17/2004	left shoulder
Maintenance Mechanic	2/2/2004	right eye
Water Meter Repair	3/4/2004	neck and back
Water Meter Repair	3/11/2004	back
Skilled LEO	5/12/2004	left leg strain
Water Meter Repair	5/13/2004	right toe, left leg

FY 2004/2005

Job Title	Date of Injury	Injury
Water Meter Repair	7/22/2004	Bee stings
Maintenance Mechanic	8/26/2004	Left Eye
Maintenance Mechanic	9/20/2004	Left finger
Maintenance Mechanic	10/13/2004	Right arm
Maintenance Mechanic	1/14/2005	Right finger
Skilled LEO	1/19/2005	left shoulder
Skilled LEO	3/21/2005	lower back
Maintenance Mechanic	5/25/2005	right knee
Laborer	6/9/2005	Left Ankle

FY 2005/2006

Job Title	Date of Injury	Injury
Laborer	6/9/2005	Left Ankle
Maintenance Mechanic	7/26/2005	Back sprain
Water Meter Repair	8/2/2005	Cut forehead
Maintenance Mechanic	8/3/2005	Contact Dermatitis
Skilled LEO	11/21/2005	Back muscle
Skilled LEO	3/6/2006	finger cut
Heavy Equipment Operator	3/29/2006	cut hand
Skilled LEO	3/27/2006	poison ivy
Skilled LEO	6/1/2006	poison ivy
Laborer	6/6/2006	poison ivy

Navy 2-5: Please provide a copy of Newport's cost allocation manual or the basis on which allocations are made.

Response: This rate case did not involve the preparation of a cost allocation model. Instead, the cost allocations inherent in the rates approved in Newport's previous three rate cases were maintained and additional revenue requirements were allocated to customer classes based on each customer class's contribution to revenues under existing rates. All allocations of costs are shown on RFC Schedule-5 submitted with my pre-filed testimony.

Navy 2-6: Please explain in detail, on what basis Newport is relying on to project the \$5,000 increase in the Contribution to Electricity Account (254).

Response: NWD has enclosed a spreadsheet detailing the derivation of its request for the electricity account. Included in this spreadsheet is an explanation of the proposed increases which include a new pump station at the Lawton Valley Treatment Plant, a 60 day operational period for the Nonquit Pump Station, and additional pumping historically required at Station 1 over what was required in FY06. NWD has also included a 6% rate increase, which is consistent with historical increases.

Prepared by: Ken Mason

National Grid

Fiscal Year 2006

	224	2223	2222	2213	2212	Acct# 2200
Totals	Distribution	Lawton Valley	Station I treatment	Supply Mainland	Supply Island	Description Administration
	ú e	\$3			56	د ۷
\$36,636.16	\$1,367.22	\$30,210,81	\$0.00	\$0,00	\$4.635.26	2005 July \$422,87
\$29,142.24	\$9,209.87	\$1,403,38	\$14,279.51	\$563.91	\$3,297.67	
\$49,143.29	\$1,224.53	\$9,547,07	\$15,300.22	\$17,195.84	\$5,536,77	
\$43,640.21	\$1,066.48	\$9.343.52	\$11,812.14	\$17,714.77	\$3,388.81	
\$25,530.78	\$1,021.12	\$8,329,30	\$13,004.56	\$1,883,30	\$830.18	2005 November \$462.32
\$31,674,83	\$1,170.02	\$12,061.58	\$13,748.65	\$2,426,78	\$1.575.00	2005 December \$692,80
\$30,124,59	\$1,198.85	\$9.973,47	\$13,852.60	\$2,928.87	\$1.568.30	2006 January \$602,50
\$27,551.31	\$1,096,32	\$9,558.41	\$11,759.49	\$2,940.00	\$1,472,71	2006 February \$724.38
\$25,440.71	\$1,291.07	\$5.717.55	\$12,817.08	\$3,354,38	\$1,609.04	2006 March \$651.59
\$14,552,88	\$980.63	\$6,120.92	\$13,067,64	\$2,930,12	\$1,027.82	2006 April \$425.75
\$24,668.21	\$890,14	\$6,728.21	\$13,833.45	\$2,197.36	\$703.89	2006 May \$315.16
\$31,,113,39	\$1,069.58	\$11,521.63	\$14,813.84	\$1,802.70	\$1.543.38	2006 June \$362.26
\$31,601.55	\$1,798.82	\$10,042.99	\$12,357.43	\$4,661.50	\$2,265.74	AVG Month \$475.07
\$379,218.60	\$21,585.83	\$120,515,85	\$148,289.18	\$55,938.03	\$27,188,83	Total \$5,700.88

	\$449,070.00	\$379,218.60	\$434,202.00		Total
	\$22,900.00	\$21,585.83	\$12,000,00	Distribution	2241
New pump station will go on line in 08 for plant residuals management.	\$130,000.00	\$120,515.85	\$130,000.00	Lawton Valley	2223
Wet weather conditions required significantly less pumping time to Lawton Valley.	\$189,000,00	\$148,289,18	\$216,500.00	Station I freatment	2222
Assumes 60 day operation of Nonquit pump station.	\$72,100.00	\$55,938.03	\$61,000,00	Supply Mainland	2213
Includes Paradise and St Marys Pond pump stations	\$28,800.00	\$27.188.83	\$7,500,00	Supply Island	2212
	\$6,270.00	\$5,700,88	\$7,202,00	Administration	2200
Proposed Rate discussion	FY06 expended Proposed Rate year	7406 expended	Docket 3675		
Rate Calculations					

Navy 2-7: Please explain when would the cost of service study and customer class demand study as agreed to in Docket 3675 Settlement Agreement and in Docket No. 3578 Settlement agreement, will be completed?

Response: It is anticipated that Newport Water will accumulate sufficient data to support a full cost allocation study within the next two years.

Navy 2-8: Please explain if any of the costs of conducting the Cost of Service study have been included in this filing?

Response: No costs specifically related to the preparation of a cost of service study are included in the rate year expenses.

Navy 2-9: Please provide a complete accounting of expenditures related to the Cost of Service Study being conducted currently.

Response: A cost of service study was not conducted in preparation for this rate filing nor is one being conducted at this time. As a result, there are no expenditures related to a cost of service study.

Navy 2-10: Please provide any studies that NWC is or has relied upon to ensure that the current rate structure is equitable to all classes.

Response: No specific studies have been performed to ensure that the current rate structure is equitable to all classes. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement in Docket 3675, Newport was not precluded from filing a general rate filing before the completion of the demand study and the cost of service study. Furthermore, the way in which Newport Water provides service to its customers has not changed significantly since Newport Water's most recent rate filing (Docket # 3675).

Navy 2-11: Please provide Docket No. 3818 RFC Schedules and supporting schedules in Excel format with formulas intact.

Response: An excel version of the rate model prepared by RFC, which contains all relevant supporting schedules was forwarded to the Service List with the responses to the Navy's first data request.