2 3

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

Of

Robert E. Benson

Chief Financial Officer

For the

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD

Before the

RHODE ISLAND PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Docket No. 4171

August 17, 2010

1		INTRODUCTION
2		
3	Q.	Please provide your full name, title and business address for the record.
4	A.	My name is Robert E. Benson. I am the Chief Financial Officer for the Pawtucket Water
5		Supply Board. My business address is 85 Branch Street, Pawtucket, RI 02860.
6		
7	Q.	Are you the same Robert Benson who filed pre-filed testimony in this Docket?
8	A.	Yes.
9		
10	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?
11	A.	I have read the pre-filed testimony of Thomas S. Catlin and Andrea C. Crane, which
12		they prepared for the Division of Public Utilities and Carriers (DPU) regarding the
13		revenue requirement in this docket. This rebuttal testimony presents my comments
14		regarding Mr. Catlin's revision to the cost of service study related to the number of fire
15		service bills and Ms. Crane's recommendations relating to PWSB's service fee
16		adjustment, consumption, payroll related expenses, and the water treatment plant
17		expenses. I would also like to address a correction to the proposed tariffs, which were
18		filed in our original rate application.
19		
20		COST OF SERVICE STUDY – NUMBER OF FIRE SERVICE BILLS
21	Q.	Are you in agreement with Mr. Catlin's revision to the number of private fire
22		service bills to be used for cost allocation?
23	A.	No I am not. Mr. Catlin is proposing to change the number of bills for private fire service
24		customers from one annual bill per year to twelve bills per year for each private fire
25		service customer. However, the switch to monthly billing also includes consolidating the
26		billing of private fire service with each customer's water service bill. Therefore, the
27		separate cost for printing and mailing private fire service bills has been eliminated in this
28		Docket.
29		
30		SERVICE INSTALLATION & SERVICE FEE REVENUE
31	Q.	Are you in agreement with Ms. Crane's use of a four year average for service
32		installation and service fee revenue?

A. I am not in agreement with Ms. Crane's adjustment to the service installation and service fee revenue. On page 16 of her testimony, Ms. Crane testified as follows:

"Prior to the test year, service installation and service fee revenue increased in each of the prior three years. However, there was sharp decline in service installation and service fee revenue in the test year. Just as the Company contends that its penalty revenue was abnormally high in the test year, so it appears that service installation and service fee revenue was abnormally low in the test year..."

Ms. Crane is correct that service fee revenue was lower in the test year, but we do not believe that it is "abnormally low." In fact, this revenue continues to decline. In FY10, which just ended, service installation and service fee revenue was only \$29,627. It is clear that the negative effects of the poor local economy are impacting this revenue source. The following table documents the declining trend:

Service Installation

Fiscal Year	and Service Fee Revenue
2004	\$ 246,389
2005	\$ 173,227
2006	\$ 202,705
2007	\$ 209,895
2008	\$ 250,895
2009 (test year	r) \$ 67,479
2010	\$ 29,627

Ms. Crane further states that "given the economic downturn during the test year, I am recommending that a four- year average for service fee installation be adopted by the Commission." Her position seems to contemplate that economic conditions are expected to return to normal in the rate year. In addition, it seems to suggest that the reduction in service fee installation and service fee revenues will reverse itself. Unfortunately, there seems to be no support for this belief.

The Rhode Island Department of Labor and Training released in 2010 a report titled "State of the State – A Statistical Profile of Rhode Island's Cities of Towns" which documents the unemployment rates, employment growth and population growth for the State of Rhode Island and each of its cities and towns. This report shows the highest unemployment rates in the state in 2009 were in the cities of Central Falls at 14.4% and Pawtucket at 13.4%. The report documents a decline in employment within the cities of Pawtucket and Central Falls in excess of the statewide decline. This report also documents a decline in population of 3.9% in Pawtucket and 1.3% in Central Falls during the period of 2000 through 2008 while the state had an overall increase of 0.2%. In addition, the poor economic conditions in Central Falls led the State of Rhode Island to appoint a receiver, who is now in charge of municipal finances. Simply put, there seem to be few, if any, indicators that the economic conditions in the PWSB's service area will improve in the rate year.

The future growth of service installation and service fee revenue is limited by the poor local economic conditions and the lack of developable real estate remaining in the cities of Pawtucket and Central Falls. Therefore, Ms. Crane's adjustment should not be accepted.

CONSUMPTION

- Q. Are you in agreement with Ms. Crane's consumption adjustment using the actual test year water sales to determine pro forma consumption revenue?
- A. I am not in agreement with Ms. Crane's adjustment to the pro forma consumption revenue for this docket. In contrast to Ms. Crane's testimony from page 12, lines 12 16, I have provided Schedule RB-06, which documents a continuing decline of billed water consumption. Also, please see my testimony above documenting the negative local economic conditions.

PAYROLL RELATED EXPENSES

- Q. Are you in agreement with Ms. Crane's adjustment eliminating the three positions currently vacant?
- **A.** No I am not in agreement with Ms. Crane's recommendation to eliminate costs for the three positions currently vacant (see her testimony on page 20, lines 9 and 10). I am in agreement with the testimony of James DeCelles on this issue, and I prepared a schedule RB-07, which is attached to his testimony and mine that supports our respective testimonies.

- Q. Are you in agreement with Ms. Crane's adjustment to the payroll tax expense?
- **A.** No, I am not in agreement with Ms. Crane's second salary and wage adjustment. The Salary Budget provided with my original testimony (Schedule RB-02) only includes the 3% salary increases effective on June 30, 2011 in each of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated with Teamster Union Local 251 and AFSCME Union Local 1012. Therefore, Ms Crane's adjustment should not be accepted.

- Q. Are you in agreement with Ms. Crane's adjustment to the payroll tax expense?
- **A.** I am not in agreement with Ms. Crane's adjustments to the payroll tax expense. As I have stated the post rate year salary increase has not been included in my salary and wage Schedule RB-02.

- Q. Are you in agreement with Ms. Crane's adjustment to the pension expense?
- **A.** I am not in agreement with Ms. Crane's adjustments to the pension expense. As I have stated above, the post rate year salary increase has not been included in my salary and wage Schedule RB-02.

WATER TREATMENT PLANT EXPENSES

- Q. Can you provide the additional information requested by Ms. Crane that reconciles the actual test year costs with Schedule RB-5?
- A. Yes I can. In the test year the PWSB received a one-time reimbursement of prior year DBO costs in the amount of \$260,013. The annual DBO costs for operating the "old facility", known as "Proposal A", included \$100,000 per year paid to AECOM/Earth Tech that was used to fund a major repair and replacement account. The terms of the DBO agreement required AECOM/Earth Tech to obtain PWSB approval for any major repairs to the original treatment facility. Once the construction of the new treatment facility was complete and successfully placed in operation, any balance remaining in this major repair and replacement account was to be returned to the PWSB. Here is the reconciliation of the test year to the annual operating costs per Schedule RB-5.

FY09 DBO Costs per Schedule RB-5 \$1,661,745

Major Repair & Replacement Account reimbursement (260,013)

Actual FY09 (Test Year) DBO Costs \$1,401,732

1	<u>TARRIFFS</u>
2	Q. In the introduction to your testimony, you indicated that the Proposed Tariffs filed
3	with the PWSB's original rate application required a correction. Can you please
4	explain?
5	A. Yes, Section C of the Appendix in our original filing contained the PWSB's proposed
6	tariffs. Schedule D set forth incorrect proposed monthly customer charges. I have
7	included the correct proposed tariff with my testimony. It should be noted that this was
8	the Schedule D that should have been included with our original filing. It does not reflect
9	our current position, and it will change when the final tariffs are filed at the conclusion of
10	this Docket.
11	CONCLUSION
12	Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
13	A. Yes.

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD

SEVEN YEAR ACTUAL BILLED CONSUMPTION HISTORY (HCF)

RATE YEAR

	Docket 3945	FY2010	FY2009	FY2008	FY2007	FY2006	FY2005	FY2004
small meters	3,001,584	2,679,077	2,773,813	2,927,770	2,884,356	3,103,794	3,111,954	3,103,649
medium meters	661,262	626,069	640,780	672,687	641,275	726,177	739,183	770,645
large meters	348,568	270,128	265,983	345,755	342,742	415,228	524,493	677,607
TOTAL Retail	4,011,414	3,575,274	3,680,576	3,946,212	3,868,373	4,245,199	4,375,630	4,551,901
Wholesale	703,674	559,457	578,899	822,591	724,925	590,875	686,462	607,116
Total Consumption	4,715,088	4,134,731	4,259,475	4,768,803	4,593,298	4,836,074	5,062,092	5,159,017

PWSB Schedule RB-07 Salary and Benefit Savings assuming 2 average vacant positions

rate per 1000 taxable limit 106,800.00 unlimited \$5.94 MERS rate 9.78% **MEDICAL PAYROLL TAXES AUTHORIZED POSITIONS INSURANCE** LIFE INSURANCE **PENSION** BASE **GMBA** Payroll Pay **ELIGIBLE** (salary + DEPT DEPT Plan **TAXABLE** OASDI MEDICARE WAGES GTL longevity + **MERS** NO. NO. Job Title Code **Total Comp** WAGES 6.20% 1.45% Medical Dental (up to 30,000) EXPENSE out of grade) Expense R32C 9560 31 Water Utility Worker - Grade 1 43,384.65 41,884.65 2,596.85 1,076.59 30,000.00 3,784.05 607.33 18,336.44 178.20 38,701.58 9570 33 Jr. Water Project Engineer R36C 38,144.43 36,644.43 2,271.95 531.34 18,336.44 1,076.59 30,000.00 178.20 37,180.63 3,635.34 Water Board Engineering Clerk 9570 33 R36C 39,664.28 38,164.28 2,366.19 553.38 18,336.44 1,076.59 30,000.00 178.20 39,664.28 3,878.17 9580 28 Water Meter Reader Service Person R28C 34,918.65 2,164.96 506.32 18,336.44 1,076.59 30,000.00 178.20 35,946.12 36,418.65 3,514.63 14,812.19 subtotal 157,612.01 9,399.95 2,198.37 73,345.75 4,306.37 712.80 2,350 18,336 3,703 averages (subtotal / 4) 39,403 550 1,077 178 x 2 x 2 x 2 2 average vacancies x 2 x 2 x 2 x 2

4,700

1,100

36,672

2,154

356

7,406

78,806

average vacancy cost savings

SCHEDULE D

PAWTUCKET WATER SUPPLY BOARD

Customer Service Charge

Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission Public Utilities Docket No. 4171

Effective: October 1, 2010

Applicability

Applicable thoughout the entire territory served by the Pawtucket Water Supply Board for residential, commercial and industrial users, exclusive of fire service connection.

Rates

For each service connected to the Pawtucket Water Supply Board's mains, the following quarterly and monthly minimum customer service charges shall apply:

Size of Meter	Cı	uarterly ustomer Charge	Monthly Customer Charge		
5/8 inch	\$	28.53	\$	11.74	
3/4 inch	\$	38.25	\$	14.98	
1 inch	\$	53.72	\$	20.13	
1 1/2 inch	\$	105.89	\$	37.53	
2 inch	\$	136.48	\$	47.72	
3 inch	\$	154.47	\$	53.72	
4 inch	\$	355.97	\$	120.89	
6 inch	\$	532.29	\$	179.66	
8 inch	\$	758.98	\$	255.22	

Terms of Payment

All customer service charges billed under this schedule are rendered on a quarterly or monthly basis and in advance and are due and payable in full when rendered.