

Scott J. Rubin

Attorney + Consultant

333 Oak Lane • Bloomsburg, PA 17815

Current Position

Public Utility Attorney and Consultant. 1994 to present. I provide legal, consulting, and expert witness services to various organizations interested in the regulation of public utilities.

Previous Positions

Lecturer in Computer Science, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, PA. 1993 to 2000.

Senior Assistant Consumer Advocate, Office of Consumer Advocate, Harrisburg, PA. 1990 to 1994.

I supervised the administrative and technical staff and shared with one other senior attorney the supervision of a legal staff of 14 attorneys.

Assistant Consumer Advocate, Office of Consumer Advocate, Harrisburg, PA. 1983 to 1990.

Associate, Laws and Staruch, Harrisburg, PA. 1981 to 1983.

Law Clerk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC. 1980 to 1981.

Research Assistant, Rockville Consulting Group, Washington, DC. 1979.

Current Professional Activities

Member, American Bar Association, Public Utility Law Section.

Member, American Water Works Association.

Admitted to practice law before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, the New York State Court of Appeals, the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and the Supreme Court of the United States.

Previous Professional Activities

Member, American Water Works Association, Rates and Charges Subcommittee, 1998-2001.

Member, Federal Advisory Committee on Disinfectants and Disinfection By-Products in Drinking Water, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC. 1992 to 1994.

Chair, Water Committee, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Washington, DC. 1990 to 1994; member of committee from 1988 to 1990.

Member, Board of Directors, Pennsylvania Energy Development Authority, Harrisburg, PA. 1990 to 1994.

Member, Small Water Systems Advisory Committee, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Resources, Harrisburg, PA. 1990 to 1992.

Member, Ad Hoc Committee on Emissions Control and Acid Rain Compliance, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, 1991.

Member, Nitrogen Oxides Subcommittee of the Acid Rain Advisory Committee, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington DC. 1991.

Education

J.D. with Honors, George Washington University, Washington, DC. 1981.

B.A. with Distinction in Political Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. 1978.

Publications and Presentations (* denotes peer-reviewed publications)

1. "Quality of Service Issues," a speech to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Consumer Conference, State College, PA. 1988.
2. K.L. Pape and S.J. Rubin, "Current Developments in Water Utility Law," in *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 1990.
3. Presentation on Water Utility Holding Companies to the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Orlando, FL. 1990.
4. "How the OCA Approaches Quality of Service Issues," a speech to the Pennsylvania Chapter of the National Association of Water Companies. 1991.
5. Presentation on the Safe Drinking Water Act to the Mid-Year Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Seattle, WA. 1991.
6. "A Consumer Advocate's View of Federal Pre-emption in Electric Utility Cases," a speech to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Electricity Conference. 1991.
7. Workshop on Safe Drinking Water Act Compliance Issues at the Mid-Year Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Washington, DC. 1992.
8. Formal Discussant, Regional Acid Rain Workshop, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and National Regulatory Research Institute, Charlotte, NC. 1992.
9. S.J. Rubin and S.P. O'Neal, "A Quantitative Assessment of the Viability of Small Water Systems in Pennsylvania," *Proceedings of the Eighth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*, National Regulatory Research Institute (Columbus, OH 1992), IV:79-97.
10. "The OCA's Concerns About Drinking Water," a speech to the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Water Conference. 1992.
11. Member, Technical Horizons Panel, Annual Meeting of the National Association of Water Companies, Hilton Head, SC. 1992.
12. M.D. Klein and S.J. Rubin, "Water and Sewer -- Update on Clean Streams, Safe Drinking Water, Waste Disposal and Pennvest," *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 1992.
13. Presentation on Small Water System Viability to the Technical Assistance Center for Small Water Companies, Pa. Department of Environmental Resources, Harrisburg, PA. 1993

14. "The Results Through a Public Service Commission Lens," speaker and participant in panel discussion at Symposium: "Impact of EPA's Allowance Auction," Washington, DC, sponsored by AER*X. 1993.
15. "The Hottest Legislative Issue of Today -- Reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act," speaker and participant in panel discussion at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association, San Antonio, TX. 1993.
16. "Water Service in the Year 2000," a speech to the Conference: "Utilities and Public Policy III: The Challenges of Change," sponsored by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. 1993.
17. "Government Regulation of the Drinking Water Supply: Is it Properly Focused?," speaker and participant in panel discussion at the National Consumers League's Forum on Drinking Water Safety and Quality, Washington, DC. 1993. Reprinted in *Rural Water*, Vol. 15 No. 1 (Spring 1994), pages 13-16.
18. "Telephone Penetration Rates for Renters in Pennsylvania," a study prepared for the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate. 1993.
19. "Zealous Advocacy, Ethical Limitations and Considerations," participant in panel discussion at "Continuing Legal Education in Ethics for Pennsylvania Lawyers," sponsored by the Office of General Counsel, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State College, PA. 1993.
20. "Serving the Customer," participant in panel discussion at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Water Companies, Williamsburg, VA. 1993.
21. "A Simple, Inexpensive, Quantitative Method to Assess the Viability of Small Water Systems," a speech to the Water Supply Symposium, New York Section of the American Water Works Association, Syracuse, NY. 1993.
22. * S.J. Rubin, "Are Water Rates Becoming Unaffordable?," *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 86, No. 2 (February 1994), pages 79-86.
23. "Why Water Rates Will Double (If We're Lucky): Federal Drinking Water Policy and Its Effect on New England," a briefing for the New England Conference of Public Utilities Commissioners, Andover, MA. 1994.
24. "Are Water Rates Becoming Unaffordable?," a speech to the Legislative and Regulatory Conference, Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies, Washington, DC. 1994.
25. "Relationships: Drinking Water, Health, Risk and Affordability," speaker and participant in panel discussion at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Association of Regulatory Commissioners, Charleston, SC. 1994.
26. "Small System Viability: Assessment Methods and Implementation Issues," speaker and participant in panel discussion at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association, New York, NY. 1994.
27. S.J. Rubin, "How much should we spend to save a life?," *Seattle Journal of Commerce*, August 18, 1994 (Protecting the Environment Supplement), pages B-4 to B-5.

28. S. Rubin, S. Bernow, M. Fulmer, J. Goldstein, and I. Peters, *An Evaluation of Kentucky-American Water Company's Long-Range Planning*, prepared for the Utility and Rate Intervention Division, Kentucky Office of the Attorney General (Tellus Institute 1994).
29. S.J. Rubin, "Small System Monitoring: What Does It Mean?," *Impacts of Monitoring for Phase II/V Drinking Water Regulations on Rural and Small Communities* (National Rural Water Association 1994), pages 6-12.
30. "Surviving the Safe Drinking Water Act," speaker at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Reno, NV. 1994.
31. "Safe Drinking Water Act Compliance -- Ratemaking Implications," speaker at the National Conference of Regulatory Attorneys, Scottsdale, AZ. 1995. Reprinted in *Water*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (Summer 1995), pages 28-29.
32. S.J. Rubin, "Water: Why Isn't it Free? The Case of Small Utilities in Pennsylvania," *Utilities, Consumers & Public Policy: Issues of Quality, Affordability, and Competition, Proceedings of the Fourth Utilities, Consumers and Public Policy Conference* (Pennsylvania State University 1995), pages 177-183.
33. S.J. Rubin, "Water Rates: An Affordable Housing Issue?," *Home Energy*, Vol. 12 No. 4 (July/August 1995), page 37.
34. Speaker and participant in the Water Policy Forum, sponsored by the National Association of Water Companies, Naples, FL. 1995.
35. Participant in panel discussion on "The Efficient and Effective Maintenance and Delivery of Potable Water at Affordable Rates to the People of New Jersey," at The New Advocacy: Protecting Consumers in the Emerging Era of Utility Competition, a conference sponsored by the New Jersey Division of the Ratepayer Advocate, Newark, NJ. 1995.
36. J.E. Cromwell III, and S.J. Rubin, *Development of Benchmark Measures for Viability Assessment* (Pa. Department of Environmental Protection 1995).
37. S. Rubin, "A Nationwide Practice from a Small Town in Pa.," *Lawyers & the Internet – a Supplement to the Legal Intelligencer and Pa. Law Weekly* (February 12, 1996), page S6.
38. "Changing Customers' Expectations in the Water Industry," speaker at the Mid-America Regulatory Commissioners Conference, Chicago, IL. 1996, reprinted in *Water* Vol. 37 No. 3 (Winter 1997), pages 12-14.
39. "Recent Federal Legislation Affecting Drinking Water Utilities," speaker at Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Hershey, PA. 1996.
40. "Clean Water at Affordable Rates: A Ratepayers Conference," moderator at symposium sponsored by the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate, Trenton, NJ. 1996.
41. "Water Workshop: How New Laws Will Affect the Economic Regulation of the Water Industry," speaker at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, San Francisco, CA. 1996.

42. * E.T. Castillo, S.J. Rubin, S.K. Keefe, and R.S. Raucher, "Restructuring Small Systems," *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January 1997), pages 65-74.
43. * J.E. Cromwell III, S.J. Rubin, F.C. Marrocco, and M.E. Leevan, "Business Planning for Small System Capacity Development," *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (January 1997), pages 47-57.
44. "Capacity Development – More than Viability Under a New Name," speaker at National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners Winter Meetings, Washington, DC. 1997.
45. * E. Castillo, S.K. Keefe, R.S. Raucher, and S.J. Rubin, *Small System Restructuring to Facilitate SDWA Compliance: An Analysis of Potential Feasibility* (AWWA Research Foundation, 1997).
46. H. Himmelberger, *et al.*, *Capacity Development Strategy Report for the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission* (Aug. 1997).
47. Briefing on Issues Affecting the Water Utility Industry, Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Boston, MA. 1997.
48. "Capacity Development in the Water Industry," speaker at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Boston, MA. 1997.
49. "The Ticking Bomb: Competitive Electric Metering, Billing, and Collection," speaker at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Boston, MA. 1997.
50. Scott J. Rubin, "A Nationwide Look at the Affordability of Water Service," *Proceedings of the 1998 Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association*, Water Research, Vol. C, No. 3, pages 113-129 (American Water Works Association, 1998).
51. Scott J. Rubin, "30 Technology Tips in 30 Minutes," *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Vol. I, pages 101-110 (Pa. Bar Institute, 1998).
52. Scott J. Rubin, "Effects of Electric and Gas Deregulation on the Water Industry," *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Vol. I, pages 139-146 (Pa. Bar Institute, 1998).
53. Scott J. Rubin, *The Challenges and Changing Mission of Utility Consumer Advocates* (American Association of Retired Persons, 1999).
54. "Consumer Advocacy for the Future," speaker at the Age of Awareness Conference, Changes and Choices: Utilities in the New Millennium, Carlisle, PA. 1999.
55. Keynote Address, \$1 Energy Fund, Inc., Annual Membership Meeting, Monroeville, PA. 1999.
56. Scott J. Rubin, "Assessing the Effect of the Proposed Radon Rule on the Affordability of Water Service," prepared for the American Water Works Association. 1999.
57. Scott J. Rubin and Janice A. Beecher, The Impacts of Electric Restructuring on the Water and Wastewater Industry, *Proceedings of the Small Drinking Water and Wastewater Systems International Symposium and Technology Expo* (Phoenix, AZ 2000), pp. 66-75.

58. American Water Works Association, *Principles of Water Rates, Fees, and Charges, Manual M1 – Fifth Edition* (AWWA 2000), Member, Editorial Committee.
59. Janice A. Beecher and Scott J. Rubin, presentation on “Special Topics in Rate Design: Affordability” at the Annual Conference and Exhibition of the American Water Works Association, Denver, CO. 2000.
60. Scott J. Rubin, “The Future of Drinking Water Regulation,” a speech at the Annual Conference and Exhibition of the American Water Works Association, Denver, CO. 2000.
61. Janice A. Beecher and Scott J. Rubin, “Deregulation Impacts and Opportunities,” a presentation at the Annual Conference and Exhibition of the American Water Works Association, Denver, CO. 2000.
62. Scott J. Rubin, “Estimating the Effect of Different Arsenic Maximum Contaminant Levels on the Affordability of Water Service,” prepared for the American Water Works Association. 2000.
63. * Janice A. Beecher and Scott J. Rubin, *Deregulation! Impacts on the Water Industry*, American Water Works Association Research Foundation, Denver, CO. 2000.
64. Scott J. Rubin, Methods for Assessing, Evaluating, and Assisting Small Water Systems, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2000.
65. Scott J. Rubin, Consumer Issues in the Water Industry, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2000.
66. “Be Utility Wise in a Restructured Utility Industry,” Keynote Address at Be UtilityWise Conference, Pittsburgh, PA. 2000.
67. Scott J. Rubin, Jason D. Sharp, and Todd S. Stewart, “The Wired Administrative Lawyer,” *5th Annual Administrative Law Symposium*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Harrisburg, PA. 2000.
68. Scott J. Rubin, “Current Developments in the Water Industry,” *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Harrisburg, PA. 2000.
69. Scott J. Rubin, “Viewpoint: Change Sickening Attitudes,” *Engineering News-Record*, Dec. 18, 2000.
70. Janice A. Beecher and Scott J. Rubin, “Ten Practices of Highly Effective Water Utilities,” *Opflow*, April 2001, pp. 1, 6-7, 16; reprinted in *Water and Wastes Digest*, December 2004, pp. 22-25.
71. Scott J. Rubin, “Pennsylvania Utilities: How Are Consumers, Workers, and Corporations Faring in the Deregulated Electricity, Gas, and Telephone Industries?” Keystone Research Center. 2001.
72. Scott J. Rubin, “Guest Perspective: A First Look at the Impact of Electric Deregulation on Pennsylvania,” *LEAP Letter*, May-June 2001, pp. 2-3.
73. Scott J. Rubin, Consumer Protection in the Water Industry, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2001.
74. Scott J. Rubin, Impacts of Deregulation on the Water Industry, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2001.

75. Scott J. Rubin, "Economic Characteristics of Small Systems," *Critical Issues in Setting Regulatory Standards*, National Rural Water Association, 2001, pp. 7-22.
76. Scott J. Rubin, "Affordability of Water Service," *Critical Issues in Setting Regulatory Standards*, National Rural Water Association, 2001, pp. 23-42.
77. Scott J. Rubin, "Criteria to Assess the Affordability of Water Service," White Paper, National Rural Water Association, 2001.
78. Scott J. Rubin, Providing Affordable Water Service to Low-Income Families, presentation to Portland Water Bureau, Portland, OR. 2001.
79. Scott J. Rubin, Issues Relating to the Affordability and Sustainability of Rates for Water Service, presentation to the Water Utility Council of the American Water Works Association, New Orleans, LA. 2002.
80. Scott J. Rubin, The Utility Industries Compared – Water, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2002.
81. Scott J. Rubin, Legal Perspective on Water Regulation, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2002.
82. Scott J. Rubin, Regulatory Options for Water Utilities, NARUC Annual Regulatory Studies Program, East Lansing, MI. 2002.
83. Scott J. Rubin, Overview of Small Water System Consolidation, presentation to National Drinking Water Advisory Council Small Systems Affordability Working Group, Washington, DC. 2002.
84. Scott J. Rubin, Defining Affordability and Low-Income Household Tradeoffs, presentation to National Drinking Water Advisory Council Small Systems Affordability Working Group, Washington, DC. 2002.
85. Scott J. Rubin, "Thinking Outside the Hearing Room," *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Harrisburg, PA. 2002.
86. Scott J. Rubin, "Update of Affordability Database," White Paper, National Rural Water Association. 2003.
87. Scott J. Rubin, *Understanding Telephone Penetration in Pennsylvania*, Council on Utility Choice, Harrisburg, PA. 2003.
88. Scott J. Rubin, *The Cost of Water and Wastewater Service in the United States*, National Rural Water Association, 2003.
89. Scott J. Rubin, What Price Safer Water? Presentation at Annual Conference of National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Atlanta, GA. 2003.
90. George M. Aman, III, Jeffrey P. Garton, Eric Petersen, and Scott J. Rubin, Challenges and Opportunities for Improving Water Supply Institutional Arrangements, *Water Law Conference*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Mechanicsburg, PA. 2004.

91. Scott J. Rubin, Serving Low-Income Water Customers. Presentation at American Water Works Association Annual Conference, Orlando, FL. 2004.
92. Scott J. Rubin, Thinking Outside the Bill: Serving Low-Income Water Customers. Presentation at National League of Cities Annual Congress of Cities, Indianapolis, IN. 2004.
93. Scott J. Rubin, Buying and Selling a Water System – Ratemaking Implications, *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference*, Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Harrisburg, PA. 2005.
94. *Thinking Outside the Bill: A Utility Manager's Guide to Assisting Low-Income Water Customers*, American Water Works Association. 2005.
95. * Scott J. Rubin, "Census Data Shed Light on US Water and Wastewater Costs," *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (April 2005), pages 99-110, reprinted in Maxwell, *The Business of Water: A Concise Overview of Challenges and Opportunities in the Water Market.*, American Water Works Association, Denver, CO. 2008.
96. Scott J. Rubin, Review of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Notice Concerning Revision of National-Level Affordability Methodology, National Rural Water Association. 2006.
97. * Robert S. Raucher, et al., *Regional Solutions to Water Supply Provision*, American Water Works Association Research Foundation, Denver, CO. 2007.
98. Scott J. Rubin, Robert Raucher, and Megan Harrod, The Relationship Between Household Financial Distress and Health: Implications for Drinking Water Regulation, National Rural Water Association. 2007.
99. * John Cromwell and Scott Rubin, *Estimating Benefits of Regional Solutions for Water and Wastewater Service*, American Water Works Association Research Foundation, Denver, CO. 2008.
100. Scott J. Rubin, "Current State of the Water Industry and Stimulus Bill Overview," in *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 2009.
101. Scott J. Rubin, Best Practice in Customer Payment Assistance Programs, webcast presentation sponsored by Water Research Foundation. 2009.
102. * Scott J. Rubin, How Should We Regulate Small Water Utilities?, National Regulatory Research Institute. 2009.
103. * John Cromwell III, et al., *Best Practices in Customer Payment Assistance Programs*, Water Research Foundation, Denver, CO. 2010.
104. * Scott J. Rubin, What Does Water Really Cost? Rate Design Principles for an Era of Supply Shortages, Infrastructure Upgrades, and Enhanced Water Conservation, , National Regulatory Research Institute. 2010.
105. Scott J. Rubin and Christopher P.N. Woodcock, Teleseminar: Water Rate Design, National Regulatory Research Institute. 2010.
106. David Monie and Scott J. Rubin, Cost of Service Studies and Water Rate Design: A Debate on the Utility and Regulatory Perspectives, Meeting of New England Chapter of National Association of Water

Companies, Newport, RI. 2010.

107. * Scott J. Rubin, A Call for Water Utility Reliability Standards: Regulating Water Utilities' Infrastructure Programs to Achieve a Balance of Safety, Risk, and Cost, National Regulatory Research Institute. 2010.
108. * Raucher, Robert S.; Rubin, Scott J.; Crawford-Brown, Douglas; and Lawson, Megan M. "Benefit-Cost Analysis for Drinking Water Standards: Efficiency, Equity, and Affordability Considerations in Small Communities," *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis*: Vol. 2: Issue 1, Article 4. 2011.
109. Scott J. Rubin, A Call for Reliability Standards, *Journal American Water Works Association*, Vol. 103, No. 1 (Jan. 2011), pp. 22-24.
110. Scott J. Rubin, Current Topics in Water: Rate Design and Reliability. Presentation to the Water Committee of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, Washington, DC. 2011.
111. Scott J. Rubin, Water Reliability and Resilience Standards, *Pennsylvania Public Utility Law Conference* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 2011.
112. Member of Expert Panel, Leadership Forum: Business Management for the Future, Annual Conference and Exposition of the American Water Works Association, Washington, DC. 2011.
113. Scott J. Rubin, Evaluating Community Affordability in Storm Water Control Plans, *Flowing into the Future: Evolving Water Issues* (Pennsylvania Bar Institute). 2011.

Testimony as an Expert Witness

1. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co. - Water Division*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00922404. 1992. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate.
2. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Shenango Valley Water Co.*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00922420. 1992. Concerning cost allocation, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
3. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co. - Water Division*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00922482. 1993. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
4. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Colony Water Co.*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00922375. 1993. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
5. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Dauphin Consolidated Water Supply Co. and General Waterworks of Pennsylvania, Inc.*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00932604. 1993. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
6. *West Penn Power Co. v. State Tax Department of West Virginia*, Circuit Court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, Civil Action No. 89-C-3056. 1993. Concerning regulatory policy and the effects of a taxation statute on out-of-state utility ratepayers, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
7. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania Gas and Water Co. - Water Division*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00932667. 1993. Concerning rate design and affordability of service, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate

8. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. National Utilities, Inc.*, Pa. Public Utility Commission, Docket R-00932828. 1994. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Pa. Office of Consumer Advocate
9. *An Investigation of the Sources of Supply and Future Demand of Kentucky-American Water Company*, Ky. Public Service Commission, Case No. 93-434. 1994. Concerning supply and demand planning, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General, Utility and Rate Intervention Division.
10. *The Petition on Behalf of Gordon's Corner Water Company for an Increase in Rates*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR94020037. 1994. Concerning revenue requirements and rate design, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
11. *Re Consumers Maine Water Company Request for Approval of Contracts with Consumers Water Company and with Ohio Water Service Company*, Me. Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 94-352. 1994. Concerning affiliated interest agreements, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
12. *In the Matter of the Application of Potomac Electric Power Company for Approval of its Third Least-Cost Plan*, D.C. Public Service Commission, Formal Case No. 917, Phase II. 1995. Concerning Clean Air Act implementation and environmental externalities, on behalf of the District of Columbia Office of the People's Counsel.
13. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of the Dayton Power and Light Company and Related Matters*, Ohio Public Utilities Commission, Case No. 94-105-EL-EFC. 1995. Concerning Clean Air Act implementation (case settled before testimony was filed), on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
14. *Kennebec Water District Proposed Increase in Rates*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 95-091. 1995. Concerning the reasonableness of planning decisions and the relationship between a publicly owned water district and a very large industrial customer, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
15. *Winter Harbor Water Company, Proposed Schedule Revisions to Introduce a Readiness-to-Serve Charge*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 95-271. 1995 and 1996. Concerning standards for, and the reasonableness of, imposing a readiness to serve charge and/or exit fee on the customers of a small investor-owned water utility, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
16. *In the Matter of the 1995 Long-Term Electric Forecast Report of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 95-203-EL-FOR, and *In the Matter of the Two-Year Review of the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company's Environmental Compliance Plan Pursuant to Section 4913.05, Revised Cost*, Case No. 95-747-EL-ECP. 1996. Concerning the reasonableness of the utility's long-range supply and demand-management plans, the reasonableness of its plan for complying with the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, and discussing methods to ensure the provision of utility service to low-income customers, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel..
17. *In the Matter of Notice of the Adjustment of the Rates of Kentucky-American Water Company*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 95-554. 1996. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and sales forecast issues, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
18. *In the Matter of the Application of Citizens Utilities Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of its Properties for Ratemaking Purposes, to Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, and to Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Provide such Rate of Return*, Arizona Corporation Commission,

Docket Nos. E-1032-95-417, *et al.* 1996. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and the price elasticity of water demand, on behalf of the Arizona Residential Utility Consumer Office.

19. *Cochrane v. Bangor Hydro-Electric Company*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 96-053. 1996. Concerning regulatory requirements for an electric utility to engage in unregulated business enterprises, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
20. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Monongahela Power Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 96-106-EL-EFC. 1996. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
21. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and Toledo Edison Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 96-107-EL-EFC and 96-108-EL-EFC. 1996. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
22. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 96-101-EL-EFC and 96-102-EL-EFC. 1997. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
23. *An Investigation of the Sources of Supply and Future Demand of Kentucky-American Water Company (Phase II)*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Docket No. 93-434. 1997. Concerning supply and demand planning, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General, Public Service Litigation Branch.
24. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Cincinnati Gas and Electric Co. and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 96-103-EL-EFC. 1997. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
25. *Bangor Hydro-Electric Company Petition for Temporary Rate Increase*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 97-201. 1997. Concerning the reasonableness of granting an electric utility's request for emergency rate relief, and related issues, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
26. *Testimony concerning H.B. 1068 Relating to Restructuring of the Natural Gas Utility Industry*, Consumer Affairs Committee, Pennsylvania House of Representatives. 1997. Concerning the provisions of proposed legislation to restructure the natural gas utility industry in Pennsylvania, on behalf of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO Gas Utility Caucus.
27. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and Toledo Edison Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 97-107-EL-EFC and 97-108-EL-EFC. 1997. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
28. *In the Matter of the Petition of Valley Road Sewerage Company for a Revision in Rates and Charges for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR92080846J. 1997. Concerning the

revenue requirements and rate design for a wastewater treatment utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.

29. *Bangor Gas Company, L.L.C., Petition for Approval to Furnish Gas Service in the State of Maine*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 97-795. 1998. Concerning the standards and public policy concerns involved in issuing a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a new natural gas utility, and related ratemaking issues, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
30. *In the Matter of the Investigation on Motion of the Commission into the Adequacy of the Public Utility Water Service Provided by Tidewater Utilities, Inc., in Areas in Southern New Castle County, Delaware*, Delaware Public Service Commission, Docket No. 309-97. 1998. Concerning the standards for the provision of efficient, sufficient, and adequate water service, and the application of those standards to a water utility, on behalf of the Delaware Division of the Public Advocate.
31. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Cincinnati Gas and Electric Co. and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 97-103-EL-EFC. 1998. Concerning fuel-related transactions with affiliated companies and the appropriate ratemaking treatment and regulatory safeguards involving such transactions, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
32. *Olde Port Mariner Fleet, Inc. Complaint Regarding Casco Bay Island Transit District's Tour and Charter Service*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 98-161. 1998. Concerning the standards and requirements for allocating costs and separating operations between regulated and unregulated operations of a transportation utility, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate and Olde Port Mariner Fleet, Inc.
33. *Central Maine Power Company Investigation of Stranded Costs, Transmission and Distribution Utility Revenue Requirements, and Rate Design*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 97-580. 1998. Concerning the treatment of existing rate discounts when designing rates for a transmission and distribution electric utility, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
34. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Manufacturers Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00984275. 1998. Concerning rate design on behalf of the Manufacturers Water Industrial Users.
35. *In the Matter of Petition of Pennsgrove Water Supply Company for an Increase in Rates for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR98030147. 1998. Concerning the revenue requirements, level of affiliated charges, and rate design for a water utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
36. *In the Matter of Petition of Seaview Water Company for an Increase in Rates for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR98040193. 1999. Concerning the revenue requirements and rate design for a water utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
37. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Ohio Power Company and Columbus Southern Power Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 98-101-EL-EFC and 98-102-EL-EFC. 1999. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.

38. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Dayton Power and Light Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 98-105-EL-EFC. 1999. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
39. *In the Matter of the Regulation of the Electric Fuel Component Contained within the Rate Schedules of Monongahela Power Company and Related Matters*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 99-106-EL-EFC. 1999. Concerning the costs and procedures associated with the implementation of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
40. *County of Suffolk, et al. v. Long Island Lighting Company, et al.*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, Case No. 87-CV-0646. 2000. Submitted two affidavits concerning the calculation and collection of court-ordered refunds to utility customers, on behalf of counsel for the plaintiffs.
41. *Northern Utilities, Inc., Petition for Waivers from Chapter 820*, Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 99-254. 2000. Concerning the standards and requirements for defining and separating a natural gas utility's core and non-core business functions, on behalf of the Maine Public Advocate.
42. *Notice of Adjustment of the Rates of Kentucky-American Water Company*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2000-120. 2000. Concerning the appropriate methods for allocating costs and designing rates, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
43. *In the Matter of the Petition of Gordon's Corner Water Company for an Increase in Rates and Charges for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR00050304. 2000. Concerning the revenue requirements and rate design for a water utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
44. *Testimony concerning Arsenic in Drinking Water: An Update on the Science, Benefits, and Costs*, Committee on Science, United States House of Representatives. 2001. Concerning the effects on low-income households and small communities from a more stringent regulation of arsenic in drinking water.
45. *In the Matter of the Application of The Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company for an Increase in Gas Rates in its Service Territory*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 01-1228-GA-AIR, *et al.* 2002. Concerning the need for and structure of a special rider and alternative form of regulation for an accelerated main replacement program, on behalf of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
46. *Pennsylvania State Treasurer's Hearing on Enron and Corporate Governance Issues*. 2002. Concerning Enron's role in Pennsylvania's electricity market and related issues, on behalf of the Pennsylvania AFL-CIO.
47. *An Investigation into the Feasibility and Advisability of Kentucky-American Water Company's Proposed Solution to its Water Supply Deficit*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2001-00117. 2002. Concerning water supply planning, regulatory oversight, and related issue, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
48. *Joint Application of Pennsylvania-American Water Company and Thames Water Aqua Holdings GmbH*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket Nos. A-212285F0096 and A-230073F0004. 2002. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of a water utility, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.

49. *Application for Approval of the Transfer of Control of Kentucky-American Water Company to RWE AG and Thames Water Aqua Holdings GmbH*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2002-00018. 2002. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of a water utility, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
50. *Joint Petition for the Consent and Approval of the Acquisition of the Outstanding Common Stock of American Water Works Company, Inc., the Parent Company and Controlling Shareholder of West Virginia-American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 01-1691-W-PC. 2002. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of a water utility, on behalf of the Consumer Advocate Division of the West Virginia Public Service Commission.
51. *Joint Petition of New Jersey-American Water Company, Inc. and Thames Water Aqua Holdings GmbH for Approval of Change in Control of New Jersey-American Water Company, Inc.*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WM01120833. 2002. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of a water utility, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
52. *Illinois-American Water Company, Proposed General Increase in Water Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 02-0690. 2003. Concerning rate design and cost of service issues, on behalf of the Illinois Office of the Attorney General.
53. *Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00038304. 2003. Concerning rate design and cost of service issues, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
54. *West Virginia-American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 03-0353-W-42T. 2003. Concerning affordability, rate design, and cost of service issues, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.
55. *Petition of Seabrook Water Corp. for an Increase in Rates and Charges for Water Service*, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Docket No. WR3010054. 2003. Concerning revenue requirements, rate design, prudence, and regulatory policy, on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Ratepayer Advocate.
56. *Chesapeake Ranch Water Co. v. Board of Commissioners of Calvert County*, U.S. District Court for Southern District of Maryland, Civil Action No. 8:03-cv-02527-AW. 2004. Submitted expert report concerning the expected level of rates under various options for serving new commercial development, on behalf of the plaintiff.
57. *Testimony concerning Lead in Drinking Water*, Committee on Government Reform, United States House of Representatives. 2004. Concerning the trade-offs faced by low-income households when drinking water costs increase, including an analysis of H.R. 4268.
58. *West Virginia-American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 04-0373-W-42T. 2004. Concerning affordability and rate comparisons, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.
59. *West Virginia-American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 04-0358-W-PC. 2004. Concerning costs, benefits, and risks associated with a wholesale water sales contract, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.

60. *Kentucky-American Water Company*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2004-00103. 2004. Concerning rate design and tariff issues, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
61. *New Landing Utility, Inc.*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 04-0610. 2005. Concerning the adequacy of service provided by, and standards of performance for, a water and wastewater utility, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
62. *People of the State of Illinois v. New Landing Utility, Inc.*, Circuit Court of the 15th Judicial District, Ogle County, Illinois, No. 00-CH-97. 2005. Concerning the standards of performance for a water and wastewater utility, including whether a receiver should be appointed to manage the utility's operations, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
63. *Hope Gas, Inc. d/b/a Dominion Hope*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 05-0304-G-42T. 2005. Concerning the utility's relationships with affiliated companies, including an appropriate level of revenues and expenses associated with services provided to and received from affiliates, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.
64. *Monongahela Power Co. and The Potomac Edison Co.*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case Nos. 05-0402-E-CN and 05-0750-E-PC. 2005. Concerning review of a plan to finance the construction of pollution control facilities and related issues, on behalf of the West Virginia Consumer Advocate Division.
65. *Joint Application of Duke Energy Corp., et al., for Approval of a Transfer and Acquisition of Control*, Case Kentucky Public Service Commission, No. 2005-00228. 2005. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed acquisition of an energy utility, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of the Attorney General.
66. *Commonwealth Edison Company proposed general revision of rates, restructuring and price unbundling of bundled service rates, and revision of other terms and conditions of service*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 05-0597. 2005. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
67. *Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00051030. 2006. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
68. *Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO, Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS, and Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenIP, proposed general increases in rates for delivery service*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 06-0070, et al. 2006. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
69. *Grens, et al., v. Illinois-American Water Co.*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 5-0681, et al. 2006. Concerning utility billing, metering, meter reading, and customer service practices, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and the Village of Homer Glen, Illinois.
70. *Commonwealth Edison Company Petition for Approval of Tariffs Implementing ComEd's Proposed Residential Rate Stabilization Program*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0411. 2006. Concerning a utility's proposed purchased power phase-in proposal, in behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.

71. *Illinois-American Water Company, Application for Approval of its Annual Reconciliation of Purchased Water and Purchased Sewage Treatment Surcharges Pursuant to 83 Ill. Adm. Code 655*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0196. 2006. Concerning the reconciliation of purchased water and sewer charges, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and the Village of Homer Glen, Illinois.
72. *Illinois-American Water Company, et al.*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0336. 2006. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed divestiture of a water utility, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
73. *Joint Petition of Kentucky-American Water Company, et al.*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2006-00197. 2006. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed divestiture of a water utility, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
74. *Aqua Illinois, Inc. Proposed Increase in Water Rates for the Kankakee Division*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0285. 2006. Concerning various revenue requirement, rate design, and tariff issues, on behalf of the County of Kankakee.
75. *Housing Authority for the City of Pottsville v. Schuylkill County Municipal Authority*, Court of Common Pleas of Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, No. S-789-2000. 2006. Concerning the reasonableness and uniformity of rates charged by a municipal water authority, on behalf of the Pottsville Housing Authority.
76. *Application of Pennsylvania-American Water Company for Approval of a Change in Control*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. A-212285F0136. 2006. Concerning the risks and benefits associated with the proposed divestiture of a water utility, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
77. *Application of Artesian Water Company, Inc., for an Increase in Water Rates*, Delaware Public Service Commission, Docket No. 06-158. 2006. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Staff of the Delaware Public Service Commission.
78. *Central Illinois Light Company, Central Illinois Public Service Company, and Illinois Power Company: Petition Requesting Approval of Deferral and Securitization of Power Costs*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 06-0448. 2006. Concerning a utility's proposed purchased power phase-in proposal, in behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
79. *Petition of Pennsylvania-American Water Company for Approval to Implement a Tariff Supplement Revising the Distribution System Improvement Charge*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. P-00062241. 2007. Concerning the reasonableness of a water utility's proposal to increase the cap on a statutorily authorized distribution system surcharge, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
80. *Adjustment of the Rates of Kentucky-American Water Company*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2007-00143. 2007. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.
81. *Application of Kentucky-American Water Company for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Authorizing the Construction of Kentucky River Station II, Associated Facilities and Transmission Main*, Kentucky Public Service Commission, Case No. 2007-00134. 2007. Concerning the life-cycle costs of a planned water supply source and the imposition of conditions on the construction of that project, on behalf of the Kentucky Office of Attorney General.

82. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00072229. 2007. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
83. *Illinois-American Water Company Application for Approval of its Annual Reconciliation of Purchased Water and Purchased Sewage Treatment Surcharges*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 07-0195. 2007. Concerning the reconciliation of purchased water and sewer charges, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
84. *In the Matter of the Application of Aqua Ohio, Inc. to Increase Its Rates for Water Service Provided In the Lake Erie Division*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No.07-0564-WW-AIR. 2007. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
85. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Aqua Pennsylvania Inc.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-00072711. 2008. Concerning rate design, on behalf of the Masthope Property Owners Council.
86. *Illinois-American Water Company Proposed increase in water and sewer rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 07-0507. 2008. Concerning rate design and demand studies, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
87. *Central Illinois Light Company, d/b/a AmerenCILCO; Central Illinois Public Service Company, d/b/a AmerenCIPS; Illinois Power Company, d/b/a AmerenIP: Proposed general increase in rates for electric delivery service*, Illinois Commerce Commission Docket Nos. 07-0585, 07-0586, 07-0587. 2008. Concerning rate design and cost of service studies, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
88. *Commonwealth Edison Company: Proposed general increase in electric rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 07-0566. 2008. Concerning rate design and cost of service studies, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
89. *In the Matter of Application of Ohio American Water Co. to Increase Its Rates*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 07-1112-WS-AIR. 2008. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
90. *In the Matter of the Application of The East Ohio Gas Company d/b/a Dominion East Ohio for Authority to Increase Rates for its Gas Service*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case Nos. 07-829-GA-AIR, et al. 2008. Concerning the need for, and structure of, an accelerated infrastructure replacement program and rate surcharge, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
91. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania American Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2008-2032689. 2008. Concerning rate design, cost of service study, and other tariff issues, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
92. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. York Water Company*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2008-2023067. 2008. Concerning rate design, cost of service study, and other tariff issues, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.

93. *Northern Illinois Gas Company d/b/a Nicor Gas Company*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 08-0363. 2008. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and automatic rate adjustments, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
94. *West Virginia American Water Company*, West Virginia Public Service Commission, Case No. 08-0900-W-42T. 2008. Concerning affiliated interest charges and relationships, on behalf of the Consumer Advocate Division of the Public Service Commission of West Virginia.
95. *Illinois-American Water Company Application for Approval of its Annual Reconciliation of Purchased Water and Purchased Sewage Treatment Surcharges*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 08-0218. 2008. Concerning the reconciliation of purchased water and sewer charges, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
96. *In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for an Increase in Electric Rates*, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Case No. 08-0709-EL-AIR. 2009. Concerning rate design and cost of service, on behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel.
97. *The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company and North Shore Gas Company Proposed General Increase in Rates for Gas Service*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 09-0166 and 09-0167. 2009. Concerning rate design and automatic rate adjustments on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General, Citizens Utility Board, and City of Chicago.
98. *Illinois-American Water Company Proposed Increase in Water and Sewer Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 09-0319. 2009. Concerning rate design and cost of service on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and Citizens Utility Board.
99. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Aqua Pennsylvania Inc.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2009-2132019. 2010. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and automatic adjustment tariffs, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
100. *Apple Canyon Utility Company and Lake Wildwood Utilities Corporation Proposed General Increases in Water Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 09-0548 and 09-0549. 2010. Concerning parent-company charges, quality of service, and other matters, on behalf of Apple Canyon Lake Property Owners' Association and Lake Wildwood Association, Inc.
101. *Application of Aquarion Water Company of Connecticut to Amend its Rate Schedules*, Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, Docket No. 10-02-13. 2010. Concerning rate design, proof of revenues, and other tariff issues, on behalf of the Connecticut Office of Consumer Counsel.
102. *Illinois-American Water Company Annual Reconciliation Of Purchased Water and Sewage Treatment Surcharges*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 09-0151. 2010. Concerning the reconciliation of purchased water and sewer charges, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
103. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Co.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket Nos. R-2010-2166212, et al. 2010. Concerning rate design and cost of service study for four wastewater utility districts, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
104. *Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO, Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS, Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenIP Petition for accounting order*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 10-0517. 2010. Concerning ratemaking procedures for a multi-district electric

and natural gas utility, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.

105. *Commonwealth Edison Company Petition for General Increase in Delivery Service Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 10-0467. 2010. Concerning rate design and cost of service study, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.
106. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. City of Lancaster Bureau of Water*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2010-2179103. 2010. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and cost allocation, on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.
107. *Application of Yankee Gas Services Company for Amended Rate Schedules*, Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control, Docket No. 10-12-02. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service for a natural gas utility, on behalf of the Connecticut Office of Consumers' Counsel.
108. *California-American Water Company*, California Public Utilities Commission, Application 10-07-007. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service for multiple water-utility service areas, on behalf of The Utility Reform Network.
109. *Little Washington Wastewater Company, Inc., Masthope Wastewater Division*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Docket No. R-2010-2207833. 2011. Concerning rate design and various revenue requirements issues, on behalf of the Masthope Property Owners Council.
110. *In the matter of Pittsfield Aqueduct Company, Inc.*, New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Case No. DW 10-090. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service on behalf of the New Hampshire Office of the Consumer Advocate.
111. *In the matters of Pennichuck Water Works, Inc. Permanent Rate Case and Petition for Approval of Special Contract with Anheuser-Busch, Inc.*, New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission Case Nos. DW 10-091 and DW 11-014. 2011. Concerning rate design, cost of service, and contract interpretation on behalf of the New Hampshire Office of the Consumer Advocate.
112. *Artesian Water Co., Inc. v. Chester Water Authority*, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania Case No. 10-CV-07453-JP. 2011. Concerning cost of service, ratemaking methods, and contract interpretation on behalf of Chester Water Authority.
113. *North Shore Gas Company and The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company Proposed General Increases in Rates for Gas Service*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 11-0280 and 11-0281. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General, the Citizens Utility Board, and the City of Chicago.
114. *Ameren Illinois Company: Proposed general increase in electric delivery service rates and gas delivery service rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 11-0279 and 11-0282. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service for natural gas and electric distribution service, on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General and the Citizens Utility Board.
115. *Pa. Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Co.*, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Docket No. R-2011-2232243. 2011. Concerning rate design, cost of service, sales forecast, and automatic rate adjustments on behalf of the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate.

116. *Aqua Illinois, Inc. Proposed General Increase in Water and Sewer Rates*, Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket No. 11-0436. 2011. Concerning rate design and cost of service on behalf of the Illinois Office of Attorney General.

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. OCA 1-36

Date of Response: 4/1/11
Witness: Arthur Gottlieb

REQUEST: What does the City believe it is “stabilizing” with the rate stabilization fund (e.g., rates, customer bills, cash flows to the City, or something else)?

RESPONSE: See responses to OCA 1-34 and 1-35. Further, the rate stabilization funds will provide a reserve to stabilize required cash flows for debt service and reduce the likelihood that Pennichuck will need to request rate increases from the Commission to address revenue shortfalls that may prove to have been the result of short term phenomena.

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – 5-11-11 TECH SESSION

Date Request Received: May 12, 2011
Request No. OCA Tech 1-1

Date of Response: June 24, 2011
Witnesses: John Patenaude, Bonalyn Hartley

REQUEST: Re Rate Stabilization Fund (RSF).

- a. Please provide references to the portion of the Joint Petitioners' filing that discusses the proposal to replenish the RSF in future rate cases after the proposed acquisition.
- b. Please describe the circumstances in which, under the Joint Petitioners' proposal, the RSF could or would be replenished. Please describe the process that will be followed.

RESPONSE:

- a. The Joint Petitioners' filing did not address the issue of replenishing the Rate Stabilization Fund ("RSF").
- b. The Joint Petitioners have proposed that each regulated utility subsidiary establish an RSF account that will be maintained as a distinct cash account (separate from the subsidiary's operating cash account) in accordance with the following provisions. As described by Mr. Patenaude in his prefiled testimony at pages 13 and 14, the fundamental purpose for the RSF account is to provide a reserve to ensure sufficient cash to enable the utility to meet its share of the City Acquisition Debt during periods when wet weather or other events result in a reduction in revenues. As described by Ms. Hartley in her prefiled testimony at pages 9 and 10, the balance in each utility subsidiary's respective RSF account will increase or decrease depending upon the particular subsidiary's earnings, and certain other factors as described below. In accordance with Ms. Hartley's testimony, the Joint Petitioners propose that the initial amount established for the RSF account for each utility subsidiary be treated as part of rate base and earn a return. With this background, the RSF account will be maintained, and any replenishment of a decline in the RSF account balance will occur, in accordance with the following specific procedures:

1. Establishment and Maintenance of RSF Account. With respect to each fiscal year:
 - (a) Subject to the qualification in paragraph 4 below, the RSF account shall be established and increased by: (i) the initial RSF cash contribution as approved by the Commission in this proceeding (the "Initial RSF Amount"); (ii) at the option of the utility's parent, any other cash contributions to the equity of the utility subsidiary that may be designated as made to the RSF Account by the utility's parent; and (iii) any net cash flow of the utility subsidiary for the applicable year in excess of the amount of cash required to pay operating and debt service costs of the utility subsidiary and the amount of such utility subsidiary's share of the City's Acquisition Indebtedness for the applicable fiscal year. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the cash balance in the RSF account shall at no time exceed the Initial RSF Amount.
 - (b) The RSF account shall be reduced by the amount of any distribution from the RSF account withdrawn in accordance with paragraph 2 below.
 - (c) The Company will provide a reconciliation of the RSF account activity as part of the PUC Annual Report for each regulated utility.
2. Withdrawals from RSF Account in General. Each regulated utility shall be authorized to withdraw from the RSF account cash, as needed, to fund any deficit in cash required to pay such utility subsidiary's share of the City's Acquisition Indebtedness.
3. Replenishment of RSF to the Initial RSF Amount. Subject to the qualification in paragraph 4 below, if the amount held in the RSF account falls below the Initial RSF Amount (an "RSF Deficit"), the regulated utility may request in a subsequent general rate case that the Commission authorize the utility to recover through a rate surcharge the amount of the RSF Deficit, which shall be based on a twenty-four month amortization period. The RSF surcharge will be calculated by taking the RSF deficit divided by the approved revenue requirement and using the derived percentage as the surcharge amount on each customer's bill (exclusive of fixed contract customers). Upon full recovery of the RSF Deficit, which may take more or less than twenty-four months depending on actual revenue levels, the RSF surcharge shall expire.
4. Designation of Disallowed RSF Replenishment Amount and Impact on Subsequent Rate Proceedings. In any proceeding to set rates for each regulated utility subsidiary, the Commission may designate an amount of disallowed cost as a "Disallowed RSF Replenishment Amount." Thereafter, the amount of any RSF surcharge to restore an RSF Deficit in any subsequent rate proceeding shall be reduced by the Disallowed RSF Replenishment Amount. The establishment of any Disallowed RSF Replenishment Amount shall not affect each regulated utility's obligation to restore the RSF to the

Initial RSF Amount through additions from such utility's net cash flow as described in paragraph 1(a)(iii) above.

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. OCA 1-56

Date of Response: 4/1/11
Witness: John Patenaude

REQUEST: Re Direct Testimony of Bonalyn Hartley, p. 10, lines 18-19. Ms. Hartley testifies, “The [‘fixed revenue requirement’] methodology reflected in Schedule A, Attachment A will be *updated with the actual amount of the bond* and rate at the time of the acquisition.” (emphasis added) Does this mean that the “actual amount of the bond” may be more than the amounts discussed in the Joint Petitioners’ testimony? *See, e.g.*, Patenaude Direct, p. 12, lines 10-12 (“the current estimate of the total borrowing to complete the merger transaction is \$157,011,440). Please explain your answer and address in your response any factors which could cause the “actual amount of the bond” to exceed the Joint Petitioners’ current estimate.

RESPONSE: The various testimonies assume the principal amount of the acquisition indebtedness to be issued by the City will be equal to \$157,011,440, based on the assumptions explained in the various testimonies. If any of those assumptions change (for example, lower or higher transaction costs), the actual final principal amount of the acquisition indebtedness may also change. These changes could result in lower or higher principal amounts. A change in the assumption that the City does not plan to refinance the existing Pennichuck debt could result in a higher principal amount. As stated in the answer to OCA 1-30, if the City could refinance such existing debt in a manner that would result in lower costs that would benefit customers, then it would bring that proposal forward to the Commission at that time. Currently, such a situation does not exist.

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. OCA 1-43

Date of Response: 4/1/11
Witness: John Patenaude

REQUEST: Please confirm the extent to which, if at all, the Joint Petitioners are seeking Commission approval of the proposed financing and the costs that comprise the total financing proposed. *See* Direct Testimony of John L. Patenaude, p. 12, line 13, through p. 13, line 15.

RESPONSE: The Joint Petitioners are not seeking Commission approval of the issuance of the general obligations bonds by the City to finance the proposed Merger. The Joint Petitioners are seeking approval of the City's proposed acquisition of the stock of Pennichuck Corporation in accordance with the provisions of the Special Legislation. The City is also seeking confirmation that the Commission accepts the ratemaking structure proposed by the Joint Petitioners that will make clear that the City will be permitted to seek rates that will ensure that the Pennichuck utilities will generate sufficient cash flow to enable the City to satisfy all of its obligations under the acquisition indebtedness. This request necessarily involves an evaluation by the Commission and other parties of the costs that are being financed through the City's issuance of the acquisition indebtedness.

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

STAFF DATA REQUESTS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. Staff 1-68

Date of Response: April 1, 2011
Witness: Arthur Gottlieb

REQUEST: Re: testimony page 9 lines 16 to 23 and page 10 lines 1-3. Is the statement that “the City expects that the rates for each of PWW, PEU, and PAC under City ownership will be lower than the level anticipated under current ownership over time” dependent upon the City acquiring an interest rate no greater than 6.5%? At what interest rate does the City calculate this statement would no longer be true?

RESPONSE: As demonstrated by Ms. Hartley’s testimony and the schedules attached to her testimony, applying the proposed ratemaking methodology and assuming consistent application of all assumptions, the revenue requirements under City ownership would be lower than under current ownership even assuming the City issues the acquisition indebtedness at a 6.5% annual interest rate. At interest rates that are substantially above that (i.e. more than 25-50 basis points higher), it is unlikely that the utilities could be operated without increasing water rates above the levels that would exist under current ownership.

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. OCA 1-45

Date of Response: 4/1/11
Witness: Arthur Gottlieb

REQUEST: Re Direct Testimony of Arthur Gottlieb, p. 3, lines 20-22. Mr. Gottlieb refers here to the Joint Petitioners' expectation that as a "starting point," the revenue requirement under City ownership will be "slightly lower" than under current ownership. *See also* Gottlieb Direct, p. 5, lines 18-20 ("revenue requirements under City ownership would start lower ... than under current ownership"). Please explain this opinion in light of the testimony of other Joint Petitioner witnesses that assume the necessity of the pending proposed increases to PAC and PWW rates in DW 10-090 and DW 10-091.

RESPONSE: Mr. Gottlieb's testimony, as illustrated and supported by Ms. Hartley's testimony, is that under certain assumptions, including that the City issues the acquisition indebtedness at an interest rate of 6.5%, would be lower than those required under current ownership. This result is illustrated with respect to a "test year" by Ms. Hartley's testimony and schedules making certain modifications and assumptions. In addition, Mr. Gottlieb's testimony carries that conclusion forward to a hypothetical closing date of the Merger in late 2011. While this analysis demonstrates this conclusion of lower revenue requirements at these hypothetical starting points, the Joint Petitioners are not requesting any rate changes at this time, assuming that the relief requested in DW 10-090 and DW 10-091 is granted. Mr. Gottlieb's testimony demonstrates that in future rate proceedings, the City's revenue requirements should be lower than those that would be required under current ownership.

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. OCA 1-57

Date of Response: 4/1/11
Witness: Bonalyn Hartley
John Patenaude

REQUEST: Re Direct Testimony of Bonalyn Hartley, p. 9, lines 1-8; p. 10, lines 1-11;
p. 18, lines 4-13; and p. 21, line 23, through p. 22, line 7.

- a. Please confirm that, in this proceeding, the Joint Petitioners seek Commission approval of a “fixed revenue requirement” methodology.
- b. In this proceeding, do the Joint Petitioners seek Commission approval of a specific “fixed revenue requirement” for PWW, PEU and PAC. (*i.e.*, that the “fixed revenue requirement” calculations in Ms. Hartley’s testimony are for illustrative purposes only). If not, when will the Joint Petitioners seek Commission approval of a specific “fixed revenue requirement” for PWW, PEU and PAC?
- c. In this proceeding, do the Joint Petitioners seek a Commission determination and/or Commission approval of any other component of the revenue requirements for ratemaking purposes for PWW, PEU and PAC? If not, when will the Joint Petitioners seek Commission approval for any other revenue requirement components?
- d. In this proceeding, do the Joint Petitioners seek a Commission determination and/or Commission approval of any specific revenue requirements for ratemaking purposes for PWW, PEU and PAC? If not, when will the Joint Petitioners seek Commission approval of the revenue requirements for PWW, PEU and PAC?

RESPONSE: a. The statement is correct as to the portion of the revenue requirement identified in Ms. Hartley’s testimony.

DW 11-026

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. OCA 1-57, Cont'd.

Date of Response: 4/1/11
Witness: Bonalyn Hartley
John Patenaude

- b. The Joint Petitioners are seeking Commission approval in this case that the ratemaking methodology proposed in Ms. Hartley's testimony is just and reasonable and will be used to determine the revenue requirement of the three utilities in all future rate cases that may be filed by any of the three utilities during the period that the City's acquisition indebtedness is outstanding. The fixed revenue requirement portion of the rates of each of the three utilities will be calculated based on known and measurable information on the day of closing and will be used by the City in all future rate cases. The City must have this assurance, evidenced by the requested Commission approval, to proceed forward with the proposed Merger.
- c. Yes, as noted in (b) above, the Joint Petitioners are requesting Commission approval of the entire ratemaking methodology proposed in Ms. Hartley's testimony. The Joint Petitioners seek Commission approval of the of the inclusion in rate base, with a return determined as illustrated in Ms. Hartley's testimony, of the applicable portion of \$5,000,000 that is invested in the capital of each of the three utilities to serve as a "rate stabilization fund" for each utility. The proposed methodology also includes a request that the fixed revenue requirement be approved at a level that generates cash flow sufficient to allow the City to pay all of its obligations under the City's acquisition indebtedness, which includes an amount that would reimburse the City for up to \$5,000,000 of the City's eminent domain costs.
- d. Assuming that the rates requested in DW 10-090 and DW 10-091 are approved by the Commission in a final, nonappealable order, the Joint Petitioners are not requesting any change to rates of the three utilities in this proceeding. Subject to the assumption regarding the outcome of the pending rate cases, the Joint Petitioners are only seeking approval of the rate making methodology presented in Ms. Hartley's testimony and a determination that future rate cases for any of the

DW 11-026

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. OCA 1-57, Cont'd.

Date of Response: 4/1/11
Witness: Bonalyn Hartley
John Patenaude

three utilities shall be determined using this approve methodology.
PWW, PEU and PAC will seek approval of a specific revenue
requirement at the time they each file their first rate case under City
ownership.

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

OCA DATA REQUESTS TO JOINT PETITIONERS – 7/12/11 TECH SESSION

Date Request Received: July 14, 2011
Request No. OCA Tech 2-3

Date of Response: August 3, 2011
Witness: John Patenaude; Don Ware

REQUEST: In response to Staff Tech 1-1, the City described its proposed “commitment not to withdraw excess utility earnings” and to apply such amounts “to future operating expenses, debt payments or capital expenditures at the utility level.” At the 7-12-11 tech session, within the context of a discussion about the proposed replenishment of the Rate Stabilization Fund, the treatment of disallowed RSF replenishment amounts and the ability of the City to use retained earnings to cover expenses or investments disallowed by the PUC, see OCA Tech 1-1 (b), the Joint Petitioners indicated a need to further discuss and clarify their RSF proposal. Please provide the clarification of the RSF proposal, including but not limited to any proposed process, tracking or reporting that would be required to ensure that amounts disallowed by the PUC are not subsequently recovered through replenishment of the RSF. Please provide a clarification of the City’s proposal related to the accumulation and use of utility retained earnings following the acquisition.

RESPONSE: As the City has consistently stated, it is prepared to proceed forward with this acquisition only if it has confidence that, under reasonable projections and with appropriate orders of the Commission, the operations of Pennichuck Corporation and its subsidiaries following the acquisition will generate sufficient revenues to cover all of the operating obligations of the Pennichuck companies and to allow the City to make all of its payments on the City Acquisition Debt. (See Testimony of Mayor Lozeau at p. 14, lines 5 to 18.) The proposal for establishment of a Rate Stabilization Fund is an integral component of achieving this objective that the City Acquisition Debt be “self-supported” by revenues of Pennichuck Corporation and its subsidiaries.

In the response to OCA Tech 1-1(b), the Joint Petitioners presented the general procedures related to the RSF accounts to be established at each utility. This

question requests more detailed procedures. The Joint Petitioners have developed the following specific procedures to address several additional aspects of the RSF, including questions relative to the relationship between costs determined by the Commission to be unrecoverable through rates and the RSF account. Further, the Joint Petitioners believe that the following procedures will serve to achieve, in a transparent and accountable way, the assurances regarding use of the RSF to support the City's obligations on the City Acquisition Debt. By establishing an account for revenues to be used to pay the CBFRR and restricting use of the RSF to supplementing amounts accrued in that account so that the RSF can only be used when needed to pay the CBFRR, the Commission and customers will be assured that such funds will not be used to pay amounts that have been disallowed for imprudence or otherwise.

To illustrate the operation of these concepts, the Joint Petitioners have attached an example as Attachment OCA Tech 2-3.

The following is a summary of the RSF methodology that addresses the issues identified in the question:

1. **Establishment of RSF Accounts.** As of the closing date of the acquisition, each utility will be allocated a pro rata portion of the \$5,000,000 RSF based upon its rate base value as of 12/31/2010 (the "Initial RSF Amount"). These RSF amounts shall be contributed to the capital of each utility upon the closing of the transaction and will be deposited into a restricted cash account (the "RSF Account").
2. **Rate of Return.** The pro rata RSF amounts will be included as equity and will be authorized to earn the ROE established in the utility's most recent rate case. A return shall be allowed on amounts held in the RSF Account, but no return shall be allowed with respect to any amount above such Initial RSF Amount.
3. **Establishment of a Separate Account for CBFRR Revenues.** To facilitate accountability related to the RSF Accounts, each utility shall also establish and maintain a separate general ledger account, known as the "CBFRR Account." Each month, each utility shall accrue into its CBFRR Account a portion of its monthly water revenues. The portion shall be determined by multiplying total actual monthly water revenues by a percentage equal to (a) the utility's current approved CBFRR amount, divided by (b) the total approved revenue requirement for the utility.
4. **The RSF Account and CBFRR Restricted Account Procedures.** The RSF Account will be held and administered by each utility as a restricted cash account. The RSF Account for a utility may only be accessed if necessary to supplement the amount recorded in the CBFRR Account for that utility to meet the utility's monthly CBFRR obligation to the City

(i.e., if the monthly amount accrued to the CBFRR Account is less than the utility's approved monthly CBFRR amount). If the monthly amount recorded in the CBFRR Account is greater than the CBFRR amount, then the excess will be added to the RSF Account. The RSF Account will be subject to replenishment or reduction through an annual rate surcharge or refund process in accordance with paragraph 5 below.

5. **Reporting and Review of the RSF Account.** Each utility will provide an annual reconciliation of the CBFRR Account and RSF Account as part of its Annual Report filed with the Commission on or before March 31 of each year.

- a. If the year-end balance in the RSF Account (reflecting all monthly adjustments pursuant to paragraph 4) is less than the Initial RSF Amount by an amount that is at least 3% lower than the Initial RSF Amount, then the entire amount of such annual deficit shall be subject to collection through rate surcharge, to be calculated as follows:
 1. The RSF surcharge would be expressed as a percentage and applied to the effective portion of the total amount billed to each customer under the utility's approved tariff rate and charges with the exception of miscellaneous charges. The surcharge shall be applied equiproportionally to all classes of customers on a service rendered basis.
 2. The calculated surcharge rate will be acted upon by the Commission before June 30th. The surcharge will appear as a separate line item on each customer's monthly bill issued between July 1 and June 30 of the following year, at which time the surcharge will be changed or eliminated to reflect the next annual review and Annual Report.
 3. Surcharge funds collected will be added only to the RSF account.

The surcharge may not exceed 5% of the last found revenue requirement for each utility.

- b. If the year-end balance in the RSF Account (reflecting all monthly adjustments pursuant to paragraph 4) is greater than the Initial RSF Amount by an amount that is at least 3% greater than the Initial RSF Amount, then the entire amount of such annual surplus shall be subject to a rate refund, to be calculated as follows:
 1. This refund would be expressed as a percentage and applied to the effective portion of the total amount billed to each customer under the utility's approved tariff rate and charges with the exception of miscellaneous charges. The refund shall be applied

equiproportionally to all classes of customers on a service rendered basis.

2. The calculated refund rate will be acted upon by the Commission before June 30th. The refund will appear as a separate line item on the customer's bill issued between July 1 and June 30 of the following year at which time the refund will be changed or eliminated to reflect the next annual review of NHPUC Annual Report.
3. Refund amounts will be subtracted only from the RSF account.

With respect to the question in the final sentence of this data request, regarding accumulation and use of retained earnings following the acquisition, the Joint Petitioners anticipate that historic retained earnings of each utility will be reset to zero upon the acquisition due to application of purchase accounting principles as described in Mr. Patenaude's supplemental testimony. Following the acquisition, the Joint Petitioners anticipate that the bulk of current earnings in any year will generally be distributed to the parent corporation to the extent necessary to provide cash flow necessary to support debt service obligations on the City Acquisition Debt. To the extent that current earnings are retained at any utility (e.g., due to favorable operating conditions), such amounts shall be maintained to support future operational needs of the utility.

Notes:

1. From BJH 1 Exhibit revised to final rate case and reflects rates granted to PWW
2. Based on year ending balance in RSF of \$4,248,818
3. Revenues allocated to the CBFRR Restricted account is the sum of the revenues collected from the RSF Surcharge/Refund and the revenues allocated to the CBFRR Restricted account.
4. A surcharge/refund will be sought when the year end balance in the RSF fund is less than \$4,121,353.73 or more than \$4,376,282.82 (3% variability threshold to the RSF starting balance @ acquisition)

DW 11-026

City of Nashua
Pennichuck Corporation
Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.
Pennichuck East Utility, Inc.
Pittsfield Aqueduct Company

Joint Petition for Approval of the Acquisition of
Pennichuck Corporation by the City of Nashua

STAFF DATA REQUESTS – SET 1

Date Request Received: 3/25/11
Request No. Staff 1-56

Date of Response: April 1, 2011
Witness: John Patenaude

REQUEST: Under the present merger agreement, would the City agree that it can seek to sell off PAC, PEU, and PWW non-core systems if it so chooses?

RESPONSE: The Merger Agreement only governs the acquisition of Pennichuck Corporation by the City. It does not provide any restriction or provision regarding future transactions involving the three utilities. Given that the three utility subsidiaries will be regulated utilities that are fully subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, their sale would be subject to approval by the Commission in the same manner that they are today.