

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN RE: PROVIDENCE WATER SUPPLY BOARD :
GENERAL RATE FILING : DOCKET NO. 4406

KENT COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY'S TENTH SET OF DATA REQUESTS
DIRECTED TO PROVIDENCE WATER SUPPLY BOARD
(Issued October 29, 2013)

KCWA 10-1. Ms. Marchand's Surrebuttal Testimony states that some or all of the 90 inch pipe on Schedule HJS Exhibit 14 is associated with the plant intake or supply and not with the transmission/distribution system.

- a. Please confirm or deny Ms. Marchand's testimony in this regard.
- b. If confirmed, how much of the 4.47 miles is associated with the supply line or intake?

KCWA 10-2. Regarding the October 24, 2013 response to Div 7-2:

- a. On the number of Providence water meters as of September 30, 2013, please break down by monthly vs. quarterly billing.
- b. On the updated to Div 1-5 (retail meters): please break these down by monthly and quarterly billing per Mr. Smith's HJS S-10 as of Sept. 30, 2013.

KCWA 10-3. Regarding the response to Div 8-6:

- a. Please explain why there are due from operations balances in the various restricted accounts as of June 30, 2013.
- b. Does Providence Water have the cash on hand to fund these accounts?
- c. Is it correct that the Revenue Reserve Fund was fully funded on 6-30/13? If so please explain what order that Providence chooses to fund the restricted accounts.
- d. What are the fund balances as of 9-30-2013?
- e. Has Providence Water asked the Commission to use the Revenue Reserve Fund to reimburse other restricted funds that were not fully funded as of 6-30-2013? If not, why not?

KCWA 10-4. Regarding the response to DIV 8-8:

- a. Did Providence Water ask Partridge Snow & Hahn to investigate how the Commission has required revenues from conversions to monthly billing to be used? If not, why not?
- b. Please provide copies of every report from Partridge Snow & Hahn regarding its research or review of PUC decisions or policies that may impact Providence Water from October 11, 2011 up to and including October 3, 2013.

KCWA 10-5. Regarding the response to KCWA 9-1 (a):

- a. If customers arrange for and pay for the repairs to services on “their side of the curb stop” why would Providence Water book any asset value for the customers’ property?
- b. How did Providence Water determine what a customer paid for the repair on their side of the service?
- c. The footnote (“***”) on the spreadsheet provided with Div 3-1 suggests that the entire \$26,614,776 of contributed capital was for service pipes. Please clarify if this was for only service pipes or for all assets (with \$5,645,788 of contributions being for service pipes).
- d. Provide a listing or backup for the \$26,614,776 or \$5,645,788 of customer owned service pipe repairs on their side of the curb stop that Providence Water has removed as contributed assets.

KCWA 10-6. The footnote to the attachment to KCWA 9-1 (b) says that the 1987 records broke down the contributed asset values of transmission and distribution mains. Please provide the detail of the 1987 records that showed those broken down contributions.

Submitted By:
Robert A. Watson, Esquire
Counsel, KCWA