BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Aqua)	
Ohio, Inc. to Increase Its Rates for Water)	Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR
Service.)	

TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO THE STIPULATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF STEVEN B. HINES

On Behalf of The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485

August 4, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRO	DUCTION1
II.		UATION OF THE STIPULATION WITH RESPECT TO THE THREE- G TEST USED BY THE PUCO2
III.	CONC	LUSION17
		<u>SCHEDULES</u>
SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH-	-2 -3 -4 -5 -6 -7 -8 -9 -10 -11	Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor Rate Base Adjustments related to Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor Depreciation Expense Adjustment for Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor Property Tax Expense Adjustment for Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor Rate Case Expense Adjustment Signing Bonus Adjustment FICA Tax Adjustment for Elimination of Signing Bonuses Account 923-2 Sundry Cost Adjustment Effect of Switching to Bills-Rendered Billing Federal Income Tax Adjustment Supporting Schedule for Federal Income Tax Adjustment OCC Adjusted Rate Base and Operating Income OCC Revenue Requirements
		<u>ATTACHMENTS</u>
SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH- SBH-	-B -C -D -E -F -G	Aqua Response to OCC Interrogatory No. 4 Aqua Application Workpaper WPB-7.1 Staff Workpaper for Staff Schedule C-3.4, Wages Annualized Aqua Response to OCC Interrogatory No. 8 Aqua Response to OCC Request to Produce No. 18 Aqua Workpaper WPC-2.1b Aqua Response to OCC Request to Produce No. 31 Aqua Response to Staff Data Request No. 8

1

I.

INTRODUCTION

2 3 *Q1*. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND POSITION. *A1*. 4 My name is Steven B. Hines. My business address is 10 West Broad Street, Suite 5 1800, Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485. I am employed by the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC" or "Consumers' Counsel") as a Principal 6 7 Regulatory Analyst. 8 9 *Q2*. ARE YOU THE SAME STEVEN HINES WHO PREVIOUSLY FILED **DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?** 10 *A2*. Yes. 11 12 13 *Q3*. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS **PROCEEDING?** 14 *A3*. My testimony, in addition to other OCC witness testimony, explains the reasons 15 why the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") should reject the 16 Stipulation and Recommendation ("Stipulation" or "Settlement") filed in this 17 proceeding on July 21, 2014. The proposed Settlement will result in unjust and 18 unreasonable charges collected from the residential customers of Aqua Ohio, Inc. 19 ("Aqua Ohio" or "the Utility"). As a result, the proposed Stipulation does not 20 represent a fair and reasonable compromise, does not benefit the customers, is not 21 in the public interest, and violates important regulatory principles and practices. 22 Therefore, the proposed Stipulation should not be approved. 23

1	II.	EVALUATI	ION OF THE STIPULATION WITH RESPECT TO THE
2		THREE-PR	ONG TEST USED BY THE PUCO.
3			
4	Q4.	WHAT CRI	TERIA DOES THE PUCO USUALLY RELY UPON FOR
5		CONSIDER	PING WHETHER TO ADOPT A STIPULATION?
6	<i>A4</i> .	It is my unde	erstanding that the PUCO will adopt a Stipulation only if it meets all
7		three of the	criteria below. The PUCO must analyze the Stipulation and decide
8		the following	g:
9		1.	Is the settlement a product of serious bargaining among
10			capable, knowledgeable parties representing diverse
11			interests?
12		2.	Does the settlement, as a package, benefit customers and
13			the public interest?
14		3.	Does the settlement package violate any important
15			regulatory principle or practice?
16			
17	Q5.	DOES THE	STIPULATION FILED IN THIS PROCEEDING MEET THOSE
18		CRITERIA?	
19	A5.	No. The Stip	oulation fails to meet any of the three criteria considered by the PUCO
20		when evalua	ting a stipulation, and should therefore be rejected. I address each of
21		the three crit	eria individually.

1	<i>Q6</i> .	REGARDING THE FIRST CRITERION, IN YOUR OPINION WAS THE
2		STIPULATION A PRODUCT OF SERIOUS NEGOTIATION AMONG ALL
3		PARTIES REPRESENTING DIVERSE INTERESTS?
4	A6.	No. The Stipulation was signed by Aqua, the PUCO Staff and the cities of
5		Marion and Tiffin (collectively referred to as "Signatory Parties"). Although
6		Marion and Tiffin were representing approximately 16,000 and 7,000 residential
7		customers respectively, a large portion of Aqua's residential customers are not
8		represented by the Signatory Parties to the Stipulation. Specifically, there are
9		approximately 28,500 residential customers in the Lake Division, 1,400
10		residential customers in the Masury Division, and 24,600 residential customers in
11		the former Ohio American Water Division that are not represented by any of the
12		Signatory Parties (See Attachment SBH-A). Thus, about 70% of Aqua's
13		residential customers' interests are not represented by the Signatory Parties. 1
14		
15	Q 7.	REGARDING THE SECOND STIPULATION CRITERION, DOES THE
16		SETTLEMENT, AS A PACKAGE, BENEFIT CUSTOMERS AND THE
17		PUBLIC INTEREST?
18	A7.	No, the Stipulation violates the second criteria in several respects. Below, I will
19		individually set forth each specific reason supporting this answer.

 $^{^{1}(54,500 + 23,000)/54,500 = 70.32\%.}$

1	<i>Q8</i> .	WHAT IS THE FIRST ISSUE YOU ADDRESS WITH REGARD TO THE
2		SECOND CRITERIA?
3	A8.	The first issue I address is the plant allocation factor used to assign Service Center
4		Plant costs to the Aqua Divisions in Ohio.
5		
6	<i>Q9</i> .	WHAT SERVICE CENTER PLANT ALLOCATOR IS USED IN THE
7		STIPULATION?
8	A9.	The Stipulation is using a plant allocator of 63.00% to allocate Service Center
9		Plant costs at issue in this case among the Aqua Divisions in Ohio. ²
10		
11	Q10.	HOW WAS THIS ALLOCATION FACTOR DETERMINED?
12	A10.	According to Application Workpaper WPB-7.1, the amount of Utility Plant in
13		Service, Depreciation Reserve, Construction Work In Progress, Customers'
14		Advances for Construction, Related Facilities, Contributions in Aid of
15		Construction, and Deferred Accounts for the Total Company and the Rate Area
16		are summed individually and then divided by each other to arrive at the Service
17		Center Plant Allocation Factor. ³

² Stipulation and Recommendation, Joint Exhibit 2.0, Schedule B-2.1, pages 13-15 (July 21, 2014).

³ Application, at Workpaper WPB-7.1; See also, Attachment SBH-B.

<i>Q11</i> .	SHOULD THE 63% ALLOCATION FACTOR BE USED TO ALLOCATE
	SERVICE CENTER RATE BASE TO THE AQUA DIVISIONS AT ISSUE IN
	THIS CASE?
A11.	No. In the calculation of the 63.00% plant allocation factor set forth in
	Application Workpaper WPB-7.1, the entire amount for the Deferred Accounts in
	is not included. According to Application Schedule B-6, the total of Deferred
	Accounts carried forward to Application Schedule B-1 is \$(10,009,497.00) and
	not \$(7,821,296.42). Recalculating Application Workpaper WPB-7.1 would yield
	a plant allocation factor 62.04%. ⁴
Q12.	WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THIS CHANGE IN ALLOCATION FACTOR
	ON THE PLANT, DEPRECIATION RESERVE, OTHER RATE BASE
	ITEMS AND DEPRECIATION EXPENSE PROPOSED IN THE
	STIPULATION?
A12.	Using a plant allocation factor of 62.04% would result in the following
	adjustments: the stipulated Gross Plant would decrease from \$10,766,843 to
	adjustments: the stipulated Gross Plant would decrease from \$10,766,843 to \$10,587,448; the stipulated Depreciation Reserve would decrease from
	\$10,587,448; the stipulated Depreciation Reserve would decrease from
	\$10,587,448; the stipulated Depreciation Reserve would decrease from \$3,871,212 to \$3,799,332; the stipulated Other Rate Base Items would decrease

⁶ See, Schedule SBH-4.

1	Q13.	WHY DOES THE PLANT ALLOCATION FACTOR PROPOSED IN THE
2		STIPULATION NOT BENEFIT CUSTOMERS AND IS NOT IN THE
3		PUBLIC INTEREST?
4	A13.	In calculating the plant allocation factor, the Stipulation neglects to include the
5		amounts in all of the Deferred Accounts. Hence, the 63.00% plant allocation
6		factor used in the Stipulation fails to reduce rate base by an additional \$100,198
7		and fails to reduce expenses by an additional \$23,141.8 This error results in
8		higher rates; therefore, it does not benefit customers and is not in the public
9		interest.
10		
11	Q14.	WHAT IS THE SECOND ISSUE YOU ADDRESS WITH REGARD TO THE
12		SECOND CRITERIA?
13	A14.	The second issue I address is the amount of rate case expense included in
14		Stipulation Joint Exhibit 2.0.
15		
16	Q15.	DOES THE STIPULATION INCLUDE RATE CASE EXPENSE?
17	A15.	Yes. On Stipulation Schedule C-3.6 there is an estimated current rate case
18		expense of \$350,000. When that amount is amortized over a period of three
19		years, it results in an estimated annual rate case expense of \$116,667.

⁷ Schedule SBH-2, \$179,395 - \$71,880 - \$7,317.

⁸ Schedule SBH-3, Depreciation Expense of \$(16,629); Schedule SBH-4, Property Tax of \$(6,512).

DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS ADJUSTMENT? 1 016. 2 *A16*. No. Although I agree with the amortization of the rate case expense over three years. I do not agree with the level of rate case expense that should be amortized. 3 Only half of the rate case expense estimate of \$350,000 should be included 4 5 because customers should not have to pay for the entire cost of a rate case that disproportionately benefits the Utility and its shareholders over customers billed 6 the increased charges. 7 8 9 *017*. WHAT ADJUSTMENT TO RATE CASE EXPENSE ARE YOU PROPOSING? 10 *A17*. I propose that \$175,000 be excluded from the rate case expense of \$350,000 as it 11 was currently estimated at the time the Stipulation was filed at the PUCO. This would result in an incremental adjustment of \$(58,333) from Stipulation Schedule 12 C-3.6. My adjustment is shown on Schedule SBH-5. If Aqua submits a final rate 13 case expense amount to the PUCO for inclusion in the Revenue Requirement, it 14 too should be accorded the same treatment that I am proposing. 15 16 WHY DOES THE AMOUNT OF RATE CASE EXPENSE PROPOSED IN *Q18*. 17 THE STIPULATION NOT BENEFIT CUSTOMERS AND IS NOT IN THE 18 **PUBLIC INTEREST?** 19 A18. The amount of rate case expense included in the Stipulation does not recognize 20 21 the fact that the Utility and its shareholders also benefit from this expenditure. It 22 would not benefit customers to pay more than their fair portion of rate case

1		expense. As a reasonable compromise, customers should only pay for half of rate
2		case expense, which would be \$175,000 or \$58,333 amortized over three years.
3		
4	Q19.	WHAT IS THE THIRD ISSUE YOU ADDRESS WITH REGARD TO THE
5		SECOND CRITERIA?
6	A19.	The third issue I address concerns the signing bonuses that are included in
7		Stipulation Joint Exhibit 2.0.
8		
9	Q20.	DID THE UTILITY INCLUDE SIGNING BONUSES IN ITS CALCULATION
10		OF WAGE ANNUALIZATION ON SCHEDULE C-3.4 OF THE
11		APPLICATION?
12	A20.	Yes. On Application Schedule WPC-3.4b, Aqua included signing bonuses
13		totaling \$10,500 in the calculation of its Wage Annualization.
14		
15	<i>Q21</i> .	DID THE PUCO STAFF INCLUDE THESE SIGNING BONUSES IN ITS
16		CALCULATION OF WAGES ANNUALIZED ON SCHEDULE C-3.4 OF THE
17		STAFF REPORT?
18	A21.	In my review of the PUCO Staff Workpapers, the PUCO Staff did include
19		\$10,500 of signing bonuses related to Union Employees. 9

⁹ Staff Report, Staff Workpapers for Staff Schedule C-3.4, Wages Annualized (See Attachment SBH-C).

1	Q22.	WAS THERE AN ADJUSTMENT TO REMOVE SIGNING BONUSES FROM
2		THE SCHEDULES FOUND IN STIPULATION JOINT EXHIBIT 2.0?
3	A22.	No. There was no such adjustment to remove signing bonuses from the
4		calculation of Wages Annualized.
5		
6	Q23.	DO YOU AGREE WITH THE INCLUSION OF THESE SIGNING BONUSES
7		IN THE CALCULATION OF WAGES?
8	A23.	No. The signing bonus was offered by Aqua in the context of labor negotiations
9		to provide an incentive for acceptance of a negotiated union contract. 10 This
10		bonus has nothing to do with the improvement of customer service or the
11		percentage of the wage increase agreed to in the contract. 11 In addition, even if an
12		employee were to do no work during the year, then he/she would still receive the
13		\$500 signing bonus. Hence, these bonuses, which were used as an enticement for
14		employees to agree to a labor contract package, has resulted in no quantifiable
15		increase in labor productivity to the benefit of consumers.
16		
17	Q24.	DID YOU MAKE AN ADJUSTMENT TO EXCLUDE THE SIGNING
18		BONUSES FROM STIPULATION JOINT EXHIBIT 2.0?
19	A24.	Yes. My adjustment to exclude the signing bonuses of \$10,500 from the
20		calculation of wages is shown on Schedule SBH-6. After the O&M Allocation
21		Percentage of 88.60% is applied, the adjustment would be \$(9,303). I have also

Aqua response to OCC Interrogatory No. 8 (See Attachment SBH-D).

¹¹ Aqua response to OCC Request to Produce No. 18 (See Attachment SBH-E).

1		prepared an adjustment of \$(/12) on Schedule SBH-/ that reflects the reduction in
2		FICA Taxes associated with my elimination of the \$9,303 in Signing Bonuses.
3		
4	Q25.	WHY DO THE SIGNING BONUSES INCLUDED IN THE STIPULATION
5		NOT BENEFIT CUSTOMERS AND IS NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?
6	A25.	The signing bonuses are not a part of the hourly labor rate in the labor contract
7		and were simply an incentive for the union to agree to sign the contract. Even if
8		there was no work performed during the year, each employee in the union would
9		still get a bonus of \$500. It does not benefit customers to pay for \$10,500 in
10		signing bonuses that could be used toward reducing their rates for water service.
11		
12	Q26.	WHAT IS THE FOURTH ISSUE YOU ADDRESS WITH REGARD TO THE
13		SECOND CRITERIA?
14	A26.	The fourth issue I address is the inclusion in Stipulation Joint Exhibit 2.0 of
15		certain sundry costs that were incurred by the Corporate Office (or "Service
16		Center").
17		
18	Q27.	DID AQUA INCLUDE IN ITS APPLICATION ANY SUNDRY COSTS IN
19		ACCOUNT 923-2, MANAGEMENT SUPERVISION FEES AND
20		EXPENSES?
21	A27.	Yes. As set forth on Workpaper WPC-2.1b, Aqua included these types of costs in
22		the total test year amount of \$4,114,247 in its Application for Corporate Office

1		(or "Service Center") Account No. 923-2, Management Supervision Fees and
2		Expenses. 12
3		
4	Q28.	DID THE PUCO STAFF EXCLUDE ANY SUNDRY COSTS IN ACCOUNT
5		923-2, MANAGEMENT SUPERVISION FEES AND EXPENSES AT THE
6		SERVICE CENTER LEVEL?
7	A28.	No. It does not appear that the PUCO Staff made any adjustments to Service
8		Center Account No. 923-2 in the Staff Report.
9		
10	Q29.	WAS THERE AN ADJUSTMENT TO REMOVE SUNDRY COSTS
11		INCURRED AT THE SERVICE CENTER FROM THE SCHEDULES
12		FOUND IN STIPULATION JOINT EXHIBIT 2.0?
13	A29.	Yes, in part. On Schedule C-3.20 of the Stipulation, the parties excluded \$1,394
14		worth of sundry costs addressed in my Direct Testimony filed on June 24, 2014. 13
15		These sundry costs related to expensive meals, catering, country clubs, casinos,
16		bar associations, and alumni affairs that were incurred at the Service Center.

¹² See Attachment SBH-F.

¹³ Direct Testimony of Steven B. Hines, pages 14-15 and Schedule SBH-12 (June 24, 2014).

1	<i>Q30</i> .	SHOULD AN ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT BE MADE TO EXCLUDE
2		CERTAIN EXPENSES WITHIN SERVICE CENTER ACCOUNT NO. 923-2?
3	A30.	Yes. After reviewing the actual sundry costs incurred during April – June 2013 of
4		the test year, I also determined that an adjustment should be made to exclude
5		costs related to Board of Directors ("BOD") Restricted Stock. 14
6		
7	<i>Q31</i> .	WHY DO YOU RECOMMEND THAT BOARD OF DIRECTORS
8		RESTRICTED STOCK SHOULD BE EXCLUDED FROM THE
9		CALCULATION OF THE RATES THAT AQUA CHARGES ITS
10		CUSTOMERS FOR WATER SERVICE?
11	A31.	This is an expense being allocated from the Service Center that does not provide a
12		direct and primary benefit to customers of the Utility.
13		
14	Q32.	WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND WITH REGARD TO THE AMOUNT OF
15		THE EXCLUSION FOR THESE COSTS THAT YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED?
16	A32.	After allocation to the Divisions at issue in this case, ¹⁵ I recommend that \$39,455
17		be excluded from consideration in this case. My adjustment is set forth on
18		Schedule SBH-8.

¹⁴ Aqua response to OCC Request to Produce No. 31 (See Attachment SBH-G).

¹⁵ Aqua response to Staff Data Request No. 8 (See Attachment SBH-H).

1	<i>Q33</i> .	WHAT IS THE FIFTH ISSUE YOU ADDRESS WITH REGARD TO THE
2		SECOND CRITERIA?
3	A33.	The fifth issue I address is the application of the rates to be determined in this on
4		a bills-rendered basis instead of a service-rendered basis.
5		
6	Q34.	WHAT METHOD OF BILLING RATES DOES THE UTILITY CURRENTLY
7		USE?
8	A34.	Aqua currently applies its rates on a service-rendered basis, which means that all
9		water delivered to the customer on and after the effective date of the rate change
10		is billed at the new rate. In other words, under a service-rendered billing method,
11		the water rates in effect at the time of service are the rates that are applied to
12		customers' bills.
13		
14	Q35.	WHAT METHOD OF BILLING RATES DOES THE STIPULATION
15		PROPOSE?
16	A35.	The Stipulation proposes that the tariffed rates will go into effect on a bills-
17		rendered basis immediately after the PUCO approves the Stipulation. ¹⁶ In other
18		words, under bills-rendered billing, the water rates in effect at the time the bill is
19		rendered are applied to its customers' bills.

¹⁶ Stipulation and Recommendation, Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR at 3 (July 21, 2014).

1	Q36.	WHY DOES THE SWITCH FROM SERVICE-RENDERED BILLING TO
2		BILLS-RENDERED BILLING NOT BENEFIT CUSTOMERS IN THIS
3		CASE?
4	A36.	If there is a switch to bills-rendered billing, Aqua will be able to apply
5		retroactively the new rates to customer water usage that occurred at least 15 days
6		before the PUCO approves the Stipulation. This would allow Aqua to collect
7		approximately \$159,000 of the rate increase from customers prematurely. 17
8		
9	Q37.	HOW DOES THE STIPULATION ADDRESS THE UTILITY'S FEDERAL
10		INCOME TAX EXPENSE?
11	A37.	As described in the Testimony of Michael J. Majoros, the Stipulation includes
12		\$4,202,711 of federal income taxes included in the rates that Aqua would be
13		permitted to annually charge customers during the time period that the rates from
14		this case are in effect. 18
15		
16	Q38.	DO YOU HAVE A RECOMMENDATION WITH RESPECT TO HOW THE
17		FEDERAL INCOME TAX EXPENSE WAS CALCULATED IN THE
18		STIPULATION?
19	A38.	Yes. I have incorporated into my testimony a schedule containing a Federal
20		Income Tax expense adjustment that is based upon the recommendations made in

¹⁷ See Schedule SBH-9.

¹⁸ See, Stipulation and Recommendation, Schedule C4, page 2of 2, line 22, Column (F); see also, Testimony of Michael J. Majoros in Opposition to the Stipulation and Recommendation, at p. 3 (August 4, 2014).

1		the testimony of OCC witness Michael J. Majoros. This adjustment is shown on
2		Schedule SBH-10 with Schedule SBH-11 being the supporting schedule.
3		
4	Q39.	DID YOU PREPARE A SCHEDULE THAT SUMMARIZES THE
5		ADJUSTMENTS YOU HAVE MADE TO RATE BASE AND OPERATING
6		INCOME?
7	A39.	Yes. Schedule SBH- 12 summarizes both my recommended adjustments and the
8		proposed adjustments advocated by OCC witness Michael Majoros to rate base
9		and operating income.
10		
11	Q40.	DID YOU PREPARE A SCHEDULE THAT SHOWS YOUR
12		RECOMMENDED REVENUE REQUIREMENTS WHEN YOUR
13		ADJUSTMENTS ARE CONSIDERED?
14	A40.	Yes. Taking into consideration the additional adjustments to rate base and
15		operating income over and above what is set forth in the Stipulation (see Exhibit
16		SBH-12), and using the rate of return of 7.20% recommended by OCC witness
17		Daniel Duann and the Federal Income Tax adjustment advocated by OCC witness
18		Michael Majoros, I have developed a revenue requirement of approximately
19		\$58,813,286. The calculation of this revenue requirement is shown on Schedule
20		SBH-13. Based on this analysis I recommend a revenue increase of \$2,163,585 or
21		3.82%. The Stipulation, however, recommends a revenue increase of \$3,820,000
22		or 6.74%. Thus, given the greater amount of the rate increase identified in the
23		Stipulation, it does not benefit customers and is not in the public interest.

1	Q41.	REGARDING THE THIRD STIPULATION CRITERION, DOES THE
2		SETTLEMENT, AS A PACKAGE, VIOLATE ANY IMPORTANT
3		REGULATORY PRINCIPLE OR PRACTICE?
4	A41.	Yes, the Stipulation violates the third criteria in several respects. I will elaborate
5		further below.
6		
7	Q42.	CONCERNING YOUR FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD ISSUES SET FORTH
8		ABOVE, HOW DOES THE STIPULATION VIOLATE IMPORTANT
9		REGULATORY PRINCIPLES OR PRACTICES?
10	A42.	These costs, that are included in the tariffed rates proposed in Stipulation Joint
11		Exhibit 3.0, are not just and reasonable as required by the Ohio Revised Code. 19
12		
13	Q43.	CONCERNING YOUR FOURTH ISSUE SET FORTH ABOVE, HOW DOES
14		THE STIPULATION VIOLATE IMPORTANT REGULATORY PRINCIPLES
15		OR PRACTICES?
16	A43.	The Corporate Office expense for the Board of Directors restricted stock does not
17		provide a direct and primary benefit to customers. ²⁰

¹⁹ R.C. 4905.22.

²⁰ Cleveland v. Pub. Utilities Comm., 63 Ohio St. 2d 62, 406 N.E.2d 1370 (1980); see also Office of Consumers' Counsel v. Pub. Utilities Comm., 67 Ohio St. 2d 153, 423 N.E.2d 820 (1981) (Justice Brown dissenting).

1	<i>Q44</i> .	CONCERNING YOUR FIFTH ISSUE SET FORTH ABOVE, HOW DOES
2		THE STIPULATION VIOLATE IMPORTANT REGULATORY PRINCIPLES
3		OR PRACTICES?
4	A44.	The shift from service-rendered billing to bills-rendered billing results in the
5		retroactive billing of rates in this case, which violates the principles set forth in
6		Lucas County Commissioners v. PUCO. ²¹
7		
8	III.	CONCLUSION
9		
10	Q45.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?
11	A45.	Yes.

²¹ Lucas County Comm'rs v. PUC, 80 Ohio St. 3d 344, 348, 686 N.E.2d 501, (1997); see also, Keco Industries, Inc. v. Cincinnati & Suburban Bell Tel. Co., 166 Ohio St. 254, 141 N.E.2d 465 (1957).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of *Testimony in Opposition to the Stipulation of Steven*B. Hines on Behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel was provided to the persons listed below via electronic transmission this 4th day of August, 2014.

/s/ Melissa R. Yost Melissa R. Yost

Deputy Consumers' Counsel

SERVICE LIST

Devin.parram@puc.state.oh.us Ryan.orourke@puc.state.oh.us sam@mwncmh.com fdarr@mwncmh.com mpritchard@mwncmh.com whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com campbell@whitt-sturtevant.com williams@whitt-sturtevant.com brent@supancehoward.com law@marionohio.org

Attorney Examiners:

<u>Jay.agranoff@puc.state.oh.us</u> James.lynn@puc.state.oh.us

Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor

		(A)		(B)	
<u>Net Plant</u>		Total Company		Rate Area	
Utility Plant in Service Depreciation Reserve CWIP Advances for Construction Related Facilities Contributions in Aid of Construction Deferred Accounts Total	* * * * * * * * * *	463,159,228.34 (125,333,580.76) 8,226,361.95 (5,923,421.53) (420.00) (89,813,218.82) (21,596,650.29) 228,718,298.89	****	255,990,661.51 (72,090,129.80) 4,514,544.51 (5,923,421.53) (420.00) (30,578,946.71) (10,009,497.00) 141,902,790.98	(a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (a) (b)

OCC Net Plant Allocation Factor Col. (B) / (A)

62.04%

⁽a) Application Workpaper WPB-7.1 (See Attachment SBH-B) (b) Application Schedule B-6, page 2 of 2

Aqua Ohio, Inc.
Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR
Rate Base Adjustments Related to Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor

			(a)				OCC Adjusted	U	tion of the control o	tromposite COC	
Description	71	Total Jurisdiction	OCC Net Plant Allocation Factor	OCC Adjusted at 62.04%	9, ∢I	Stipulation <u>Adjustments</u>	Stipulation Adjustments)	Adjusted at 63.00%	Related to Change in Allocation Factor	
Service Center Plant (b)	€9	18,687,019	62.04% \$		↔	(1,005,979) \$	11,593,427 \$ (1,005,979) \$ 10,587,448 \$ 10,766,843	€9	10,766,843	\$ (179,395)	
Service Center Depreciation Reserve (c)	€9	7,487,450	62.04% \$	\$ 4,645,214 \$	↔	(845,882) \$		₩	3,799,332 \$ 3,871,212	\$ (71,880)	
Deferred Income Taxes - Liberalized Depreciation - Service Center (d)	₩	762, 197	62.04% \$	\$ 472,867	69	,	472,867 \$	€9	480,184	\$ (7,317)	

⁽a) Schedule SBH-1
(b) Stipulation Schedule B-2.1, page 15 of 15
(c) Stipulation Schedule B-3, page 15 of 15
(d) Staff Schedule B-6, page 1, line 20

Aqua Ohio, Inc.
Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR
Depreciation Expense Adjustment for
Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor

\$000A		(a)	(q)		(a)	OCC Adjusted Net of	ted (c)	000 000	OCC Calculated	Stipt ((d) Stipulation
Number	Service Center Account Description	Total	OCC Net Plant	OCC Adjusted		Stipulation				Depre	eciation
		Jurisdiction	Allocation Factor	at 62.04%	Adjustments		its Accrual Rates			Ä	Expense
303	Miscellaneous Intancible Plant (e)	\$ 14,504,886	Ū	\$ 8,998,83	(1,007,381)	8	•	\$ \$	862,277	₩	377,498
390	Structures & Improvements	\$ 1,021,017	Ī	\$ 633,43	Ð	6)		€ 9	13,302	ss	13,508
390-1	Structures & Improvements - Leasehold Improvements (f)	\$ 1,025,947	Ĭ	\$ 636,49	9	\$ 636,		\$	1,400	€9	1,436
391-1	Office Furniture and Equipment	\$ 195,796	_	\$ 121,47	9	\$ 121,		\$	4,361	69	4,428
391-2	Office Furniture and Equipment - Data Processing	\$ 739,676	Ī	\$ 458,89	5 \$ 1,402	\$ 460,		\$	41,979	€9	42,627
391-3	Office Furniture and Equipment - Computers	\$ 297,895	Ī	\$ 184,81		\$ 184,		\$	22,363	s)	22,708
394	Tools. Shop and Garage Equipment	\$ 60.598	62.04%	\$ 37,595	9	\$ 37,595	3.85%	69	1,447	69	1,470
397	Communication Equipment	\$ 108,746	Ī	\$ 67,46	9	\$ 67,		\$	4,149	€9	4,213
398	Miscellaneous Equipment	\$ 38,663	_	\$ 23,98	. 8 /	\$ 23,		\$ 9	1,276	49	1,296
	Total Service Center	\$ 17,993,224						€9	952,555	о, со	969,184
	OCC Reduction in Depreciation Expense related to									€9	(16,629)

OCC Reduction in Depreciation Expense related to Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor

⁽a) Stipulation Schedule B-3, pages 13-15
(b) See Schedule SBH-1
(c) Stipulation Schedule B-3, pages 13-15
(d) Stipulation Schedule B-32, pages 13-16
(e) Stipulation Schedule B-32, page 13. Depreciation Accrual rate calculated as 877,498 / 8,130,697 = 10.79%
(f) Stipulation Schedule B-3.2, page 14. Depreciation Accrual rate calculated as 1,436 / 646,347 = 0.22%

Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR Property Tax Expense Adjustment for Change in Net Plant Allocation Factor

	<u>Description</u>	<u>!</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
1.)	OCC Adjustment related to change in Plant Allocation Factor	\$	(179,395)	(a)
2.)	Assessment Valuation Percentage		42.73%	(b)
3.)	Valuation at 3/31/14 for OCC Adjustment (1) x (2)	\$	(76,655)	
4.)	Average Property Tax Rate	\$	0.08495	(c)
5.)	OCC Recommended Adjustment to Property Tax (3) x (4)	\$	(6,512)	

⁽a) See Exhibit SBH - 2

⁽b) Stipulation Schedule C-3.23a, line 11

⁽c) Stipulation Schedule C-3.23a, line 23 (84.95 / 1,000)

Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR Rate Case Expense Adjustment

Water A

2. (.)	Total Estimated Rate Case Expense (a) Company/Customer Sharing	₩	350,000 50%
3.)	Customer Responsibility (1) x (2) Three-Year Amortization (a)	₩	175,000
5.)	Annual Rate Case Expense (3) / (4) Test Year Amount (a)		58,333 356,031
7.)	OCC Adjustment to Test Year Amount (5) - (6) Stipulation Adjustment to Test Year Amount (a)	ଡ ଡ	(297,698) (239,364)
6.	OCC Incremental Adjustment (7) - (8)	↔	(58,334)

(a) Stipulation Schedule C-3.6

Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR Signing Bonus Adjustment

	<u>Description</u>	4	Amount	
1.)	Signing Bonus included in Wage Annualization	\$	(10,500)	(a)
2.)	O&M Allocation Percentage		88.60%	(b)
3.)	OCC Adjustment to exclude Signing Bonus	\$	(9,303)	

⁽a) Staff Workpapers (See Attachment SBH-C)(b) Staff Schedule C-3.4

Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR FICA Tax Adjustment for Elimination of Signing Bonuses

	<u>Description</u>		Service Center Account 391-2	
1.)	OCC Adjustment to exclude Signing Bonus	\$	(9,303)	(a)
2.)	OASDI Tax at .062	\$	(577)	(b)
3.)	Health Insurance at .0145	\$	(135)	(b)
4.)	Total OCC Adjustment to FICA Tax (2) + (3)	\$_	(712)	

⁽a) See Schedule SBH - 6 (b) Aqua Schedule WPC-3.18, Lines 7 and 9

Schedule SBH - 8

Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR Account 923-2 Sundry Cost Adjustment

	Divisional	Cost
(Q)	Allocation	Factor
(a)	Total	Ohio Cost
		티
		Description

Account 923-2 Sundry Expenses - BOD Restricted Stock OCC Incremental Adjustment to Sundry Expenses	\$ (64,144.83)	61.51% <u>\$ (39,455.48)</u> \$ (39,455)
Stipulation Adjusted Budget Expense (c)		\$ 3,931,120
Stipulation Adjusted Budget Expense net of OCC Adjustment		\$ 3,891,665
Test Year Budget Expense (c)		\$ 4,281,749
Budget Expense Adjustment with OCC Incremental Adjustment		\$ (390,084)

⁽a) Response to OCC Request to Produce No. 31 (See Attachment SBH-G)(b) Response to Staff Data Request No. 8 (See Attachment SBH-H)(c) Stipulation Schedule C-3.20

Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW-AIR Effect of Switching to Bills-Rendered Billing

Stipulated Rate Increase per Month (1) / (2) Number of Days in a Month Stipulated Rate Increase per Day (3) / (4) Number of Revenue Lead Days	Stipulation Revenue Increase Recommended (a) Number of Months in the Year	₩	3,820,000	
₩.	Stipulated Rate Increase per Month (1) / (2) Number of Days in a Month	φ.	318,333	
	Stipulated Rate Increase per Day (3) / (4) Number of Revenue Lead Days	↔	10,611	

2 1 1 1

3.0

5.)

7:

(a) Stipulation Joint Exhibit 2.0, Schedule A-1, line 17

INC.

AQUA OHIO, INC. CASE NO. 13-2124 WW-AIR TEST YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 2014

FEDERAL INCOME TAX EXPENSE - DEFERRED PORTION ONLY / CURRENT SET AT \$0

Schedule SBH-10

	၁၁၀	CC Adjusted with FIT	Adjustments	S.	Reference	Adji	Adjusted Revenue Requirement Increase	Reference
Rate Base	€9	150,126,988	. ↔			•	150,126,988	150,126,988 Schedule SBH-13- Line 1
Total Operating Revenues (Adjusted Current)	↔	56,649,701	\$,		€9	56,649,701	56,649,701 Schedule SBH-13 - Line 9
Operating Expenses Before FIT	€9 €	44,656,453	9 9 9	- 269 064	B13 + C13	↔ ••	44,656,453 3.215.244	44,656,453 Schedule SBH-12 3.215.244 Schedule SBH-11
rederal income Taxes (Schedule SBH-12) Total Operating Expenses (Schedule SBH-12)	9 49	47,602,633	\$ 26	269,064		69	47,871,697	
Bequired Operating Income (Schedule SBH-13)	s	10,809,143	s	•		69	10,809,143	Line G8*7.20%
Current Operating Income (Schedule SBH-12)	₩.	9,047,068	4	(269,064)	B18-C18	s	8,778,004	E11-E15
Income Deficiency (Schedule SBH-13)	G	1,762,075	€	269,064		49	2,031,139	E17-E18
Gross Revenue Conversion (Schedule SBH-13) Revenue Increase Required (Schedule SBH-13)	s	1.63878 2,887,653	\$ (72	(724,068)		ь	1.06521 2,163,585	1.06521 (1) PUCO Staff Report Schedule A-2 2,163,585 Line G20 * Line G19

(1) As Adjusted to reflect \$0 for FIT - Current Gross Up

AQUA OHIO, INC. CASE NO. 13-2124 WW-AIR TEST YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 2014									Sched	Schedule SBH-11	
		FEDERAL INCOME	NCOME TAX SUMMARY	IARY							
	j			Adjusted Stip	Stipulation	Stip	Stipulation	;		4	
Current FIT	Com	Company Present A	Adjustments	Present	Adjustments	Propo	Proposed Rates	Adjustments		၁၁၀	References
Operating Income Before FIT	49	11,584,029 \$	349,048 \$	11,933,077	\$ 3,586,198	€9	15,519,275		69	•	
Interest Charges	69	(2,895,688) \$	(770,446) \$	(3,666,134) \$		↔	(3,666,134)			(\$3,633,073)	Schedule SBH-13 Line 1 * 2.42%
Tax Accelerated Depreciation	49	_	(5,819,701) \$	(12,968,765)		€9	(12,968,765)		69	(12,968,765)	
Book Depreciation	49	6,304,699 \$	464,646 \$		•	69	6,769,345		es	6,769,345	
Excess Tax over Book	↔	(844,365) \$	\$ (550'556'5)	(6,199,420) \$		(A	(6,199,420)		69	(6,199,420)	
Repair Tax Deduction	⇔	↔	(2,832,391) \$	(2,832,391) \$	ί.	es.	(2,832,391)		€9	(2,832,391)	
Misc. Deferred Items	69	(6,752) \$	6,752 \$	θ		49	•				
Subtotal	€	(3,746,805) \$	(8,951,140) \$	(12,697,945) \$	ا	49	(12,697,945)		69	(12,664,884)	
Taxable Income	49	7,837,224 \$	(8,602,092) \$	(764,868) \$	\$ 3,586,198	()	2,821,330		69	•	
FIT at 35%	69	2,743,028 \$	(3,010,732) \$	(267,704) \$	\$ 1,255,169	69	987,466		€9	•	
Investment Tax Credits	69	•	49	٠,		69	•				
FIT - Current	8	2,743,028 \$	(3,010,732) \$	(267,704)	\$ 1,255,169	49	987,466		49	-	
Deferred FIT											
Tax Accelerated Depreciation	49	7,149,064 \$	5,819,701 \$	_			(12,968,765)		υ	(12,968,765)	
Tax Straight Line Depreciation	€9					es	6,559,163		ss	6,559,163	
Excess of Accelerated over S/L	€9	844,365 \$	5,565,237 \$	6,409,602		69	(6,409,602)		↔	(6,409,602)	
Deferred Income Tax at 35%	69	295,528 \$	1,947,833 \$	2,243,361		€9	2,243,361		s	2,243,361	
Deferred Income Tax at 35% RTA	69	УЭ ,	991,337 \$	991,337		€9	991,337		€9	991,337	
Amortization of Prior Year ITC	æ	(4,230) \$	(15,224) \$	(19,454)		69	(19,454)		69	(19,454)	
ITC - Net	49	(4,230) \$	976,113 \$	971,883		49	971,883		€9	971,883	
Total Deferred Taxes	s o	291,298 \$	2,923,946 \$	3,215,244		69	3,215,244		8	3,215,244	
Total Federal Income Taxes	ss.	3,034,326 \$	\$ (98,786)	2,947,540	\$ 1,255,169	s	4,202,709		65	3,215,244	To Schedule SBH-10 Line 13

Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW -AIR OCC Adjusted Rate Base and Operating Income

	Staff Adjusted (a)	OCC Adjustments (b)	OCC Adjusted (c)
Rate Base	150,227,186	(100,198)	
Total Operating Revenues	56,649,701	-	56,649,701
Operating Expense before FIT Federal Income Taxes Total Operating Expenses	44,787,364 2,899,512 47,686,876	(130,911) 46,668 (84,243)	44,656,453 2,946,180 47,602,633
Net Operating Income	8,962,825	84,243	\$ 9,047,068
(a) Staff Report Schedules B-1 and C-2			
(b) OCC Operating Revenue Schedules:			
Total OCC Revenue Adjustments		-	
SBH O&M Expense Exhibits and FIT impact at 35% rate:			
SBH-4 Property Tax Expense related to Change in Net Plant Allocation	on Factor	- (6,512)	
SBH-3 Depreciation Expense related to Change in Net Plant Allocation	on Factor	(16,629)	
SBH-6 Signing Bonuses SBH-5 Rate Case Expense SBH-8 Sundry Cost - Service Center Account 923-2 SBH-7 FICA Tax assoc. with Signing Bonuses Total OCC Expense Adjustments OCC FIT Expense Adjustment		(9,303) (58,333) (39,422) (712) (130,911) 45,819	
SBH Rate Base Exhibits and FIT impact at 35% rate:		-	
SBH-7 Change in Plant related to Net Plant Allocation Factor SBH-7 Change in Depreciation Reserve related to Net Plant Allocation SBH-7 Change in Other Rate Base Items related to Net Plant Allocation DM-1 Regulatory Asset - Deferred Depreciation OCC Decrease to Staff Rate Base x Weighted cost of debt (Staff Schedule C-4) Decrease to Interest Charges x FIT tax rate		(179,395) 71,880 7,317 - (100,198) 2,42% (2,425) 35% 849	
OCC Increase to FIT Expense		043	

(c) Stipulation +/- OCC Adjustments

OCC Revenue Requirements Aqua Ohio, Inc. Case No. 13-2124-WW -AIR

	Applicant	Stipulation Lower Bound	Stipulation Upper Bound	OCC Adjusted
	(a)	(a)	(a)	(p)
Rate Base	152,450,469	151,493,153	151,493,153 \$	150,126,988
Net Operating Income	7,720,595	8,985,537	8,985,537	9,047,068
Rate of Return Earned	2.06%	5.93%	5.93%	6.03%
Rate of Return Recommended (c)	7.73%	7.47%	7.47%	7.20%
Required Operating Income	11,784,421	11,316,539	11,316,539	10,809,143
Income Deficiency	4,063,826	2,331,002	2,331,002	1,762,075
Gross Revenue Conversion Factor	1.638780	1.638780	1.638780	1.638780
Revenue Increase Required before FIT Adjustment	6,659,718	3,820,000	3,820,000	2,887,653
Adjusted Operating Revenue				56,649,701
Revenue Requirements before FIT Adjustment				59,537,354
FIT Adjustment (d)				(724,068)
Revenue Increase Required after FIT Adjustment				2,163,585
Revenue Increase Recommended	6,659,718	3,820,000	3,820,000	2,163,585
Adjusted Operating Revenue	56,649,701	56,649,701	56,649,701	56,649,701
Revenue Requirements after FIT Adjustment	63,309,420	60,469,701	60,469,701	58,813,286
Increase over Current Revenue	11.76%	6.74%	6.74%	3.82%

6

11.

12.)

13.)

10.)

2.

(.)

7.

8

3.

is

<u>;</u>

16.)

15.)

14.)

 ⁽a) Stipulation Schedule A-1
 (b) Schedule SBH-12
 (c) OCC Rate of Retum - Testimony of OCC Witness Duann
 (d) Schedule SBH-10

Inter. No. 4: Please provide the most current numbers of residential customers served in each respective service territory listed in Exhibit 1 of Schedule S-4.1 filed with the Application.

RESPONSE: See attached "Inter. No. 4" (Att. at p. 2–3).

Inter. No. 4: Please provide the most current numbers of residential customers served in each respective service territory listed in Exhibit 1 of Schedule S-4.1 filed with the Application.

RESPONSE: See attached "Inter. No. 4" (Att. at p. 2-3).

Inter. No. 4

AQUA OHIO, INC. NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS AS OF JUNE 30, 2013

LAKE ERIE	28,449
STARK REGIONAL	33,361
STRUTHERS .	17,497
MASURY	1,390
ASHTABULA	11,443
MARION	16,045
TIFFIN	6,910
FRANKLIN COUNTY WATER	7,802
FRANKLIN COUNTY SEWER	6,407
MANSFIELD	1,356
PORTAGE COUNTY	853
LAWRENCE COUNTY (includes LAKE WHITE)	3,190
TOTAL	134,703

. .

] !			100	
Officer	0.00 Other	0.00 Other	0.00 Other	0.00 Other	0.00 Other	0.00 Other	0.00 Other	Officer	Other	Other	0.00 Other	Officer	Other	Officer	Other	Other	Other	0.00 Other	Other	Officer	
19.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	00.0	900	0 0	000	000	0.00 Officer	0.00	0.90 Other	0.00	00.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	000	0.00 Other	0.80 Other	000
500.00 910 Clien	8	99	8	8	8	96	8	90	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	88	8	36	
200	500.00	200.00	500.00	599.00	500.00	590.06	500.00	200.00	500.00	290.00	500.00	-00.00S	500.00	200 000	500.00	500.00	500.00	500 00	500.00	500 000	
												23 13 23									
								15.		90		40									
												7				9 3					
Shafts	Sonus	diffic	Sonus	Series	Sonus	30nus	Sonus	Sonds	Sonus	Serrice	Souns	20 TO	Sonus	Some's.	Sonus	Sperior	Sonus	Some	Sonus	Sonus	
PARTY BUILDS	4/14/13 Bonus	4/14/18/20	4/14/13 Bonus	4件的 Beines	4/14/13 Bonus	本种(3 Bonus	4/14/13 Bonus	4F4F3 Bonus	4/14/13 Bonus	4/14/13 Bornts	4/14/13 Bonus	4/14/13 Benus	4/14/13 Bonus	4/14/13/Boats	4/14/13 Bonus	4714/13 Banks	4/14/13 Bonus	47415 Bonus	4/14/13 Bonus	4件4代3 Bonus	
-	4	7	4		4	PSP*	4		4	4	4	24	4	4	4	7	4	7	4		
88	150	150	150	156	150	150	150	158	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	450	
4		2.2				90 00 11		11				,W		28				158			
51050	51056	51059	51060	51062	51067	51069	51070	51072	51073	51074	51075	51076	1105	52414	52599	80170	80295	80433	80442	80733	

\$ 10,500 2011 Armid \$ 10,500 2013 Four \$ 19,500 2013 Fronce **Inter. No. 8:** Referring to Page 2 of WPC-3.4b, what is a "signing bonus"?

RESPONSE: A signing bonus was offered by Aqua Ohio in the context of labor negotiations to provide an incentive for acceptance of a negotiated union contract.

RFP No. 18: Referring to OCC Interrogatory No. 8, please provide the labor contract and/or contract amendment that contains a provision providing for a "signing bonus."

RESPONSE: See "Response to RFP No. 18," attached.

Company Proposal and Counters to Union Offers

March 21, 2011

1500 hours

4 YEAR AGREEMENT

T/A #3

Company Proposals

Proposal #4, Article XII, Section 1- Holidays - Withdrawn

Proposal #5, Article XIII, Pension - In the event of pension freeze, company guarantees white star 401k adjustment to a level no less than a company match of 50% of the employee's first 6% contribution plus any discretionary profit sharing contributions. In the event of a pension freeze, any future adjustments made to enhance the existing Blue Star 401k will be realized by the union. No change to existing pension earlier than 12/31/14.

Proposal #6, Article XV, Section 1, Medical Insurance – Full flexibility for union healthcare at 7/1/11. For employees enrolled within the Aqua Ohio Health Plan, company will contribute to an FSA at \$250 for individuals, \$500 for family the first year (individuals must complete required health risk assessment). If an HRA or HSA is established in future years, the union will be eligible for the same benefits offered to all non union employees within the Aqua Ohio Health Plan.

Proposal #7, Article XV, Section 5, Payment of Premiums - Non union and union the same contribution level (for 2011: 20% for base wage > \$45,000, 15% for base wage < \$45,000); union contribution not to exceed 20% during term of agreement

Union Proposals

Proposal #1 – Withdrawn

Proposal #2 - Withdrawn

Proposal #3, Article VII, Section 1, Hours of Work — Company will enter into an informal agreement for 2011 only; during June, July, and August, distribution technicians scheduled to work within the distribution department shall be scheduled Monday-Friday 7:00 a.m. — 3:30 pm. Company will meet with union at conclusion of informal agreement to evaluate viability for remaining years.

Proposal #5, Article X, Section 1, Wages – Four year agreement, 3.5% for year 1. (Year 1 effective upon union ratification), an \$800 signing bonus in Year 1. Years 2-4, 3.0%, \$500 signing bonus per employee.

Proposal #6, Article X, Section 6, License and Premiums - \$.05 increase in license premiums upon healthcare enrollment.

Proposal #8, Article XIV, Group Life Insurance – Accept GL change to 1.5 times increase, improve retiree benefit to \$7500 for retirees after 4/1/11.

Proposal #9 - Withdrawn

Proposal#10 - Withdrawn

Proposal #11, Article XV111, Conclusion – 4 year agreement

Proposal #12, Savings Plan (401k) - No interest, See Company Proposal #5

Proposal #13, White Star, Blue Star descriptions included as exhibits within contract – Agreed

P. Polle 3/21/11

Donald P. Opatka, Region III Director, UWUA

Edmund P. Kolodziej, President, Aqua Ohio

AQUA OHIO, INC.
Lake / Masury / Prior American Properties
Case No. 13-2124-wW-AIR
Administrative & General Expenses
Corporate Office
For the Twelve Months Ended March 31, 2014

RAH 6/30/2013 WPC-2.1b

INITIALS DATE

Data: (3) Months Actual & (9) Months Estimated

NO.	ACCOUNT NO.	VT DESCRIPTION	APR 2013	MAY 2013	3013	JUL 2013	AUG 2013	SEP 2013	OCT 2013	NOV 2013	DEC 2013	JAN 2014	FEB 2014	MAR 2014	TOTAL
-	920-1	ADMIN. & GENERAL SALARIES	167,902	175,745	152,590	171,748	165,223	158,231	171,748	158,231	165,223	166,391	145,702	155,204	1,953,938
2	921-2	EXP. OF EMPLOYEES IN A/C 920													0
ღ	921-3	TELEPHONE	1,294	910	1,105	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	16,810
4	921-4	MEMBERSHIP FEES AND DUES	5,289	6,548	6,363	4,633	4,183	4,183	4,183	4,183	4,183	4,183	4,183	7,183	59,296
2	921-5	PRINTING & POSTAGE	184	181	551	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	5,416
9	921-6	UTILITIES	337	4,319	2,421	2,425	2,425	2,450	2,600	2,675	3,350	3,350	3,200	2,975	32,527
7	921-7	MISC. SUPPLIES & EXPENSES	13,404	6,782	6,015	7,243	7,243	7,243	7,243	7,243	7,243	7,243	7,243	7,243	91,387
œ	923-2	MGT. SUPV. FEES & EXPENSES	366,400	322,315	489,794	290,032	305,704	423,607	287,553	290,505	333,935	301,706	347,983	354,713	4,114,247
o,	923-3	ACCOUNTING SERVICES	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	18,021	216,252
10	923-4	LEGAL SERVICES	19,396	1,017	14,242	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667	184,658
=	923-5	MISC. SERVICES	20,456	21,894	26,164	24,435	27,235	23,935	25,135	23,935	24,235	26,685	24,085	24,085	292,279
5	924	PROPERTY INSURANCE	260	260	260	260	260	260	260	5 60	260	260	260	260	3,120
13	925-2	LIABILITY INSURANCE	280	280	4,775	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,335
14	925-3	WORKER'S COMPENSATION	2,920	2,920	71	2,920	2,920	2,920	2,920	2,920	2,920	2,920	2,920	2,920	32,191
15	926-2	EMPLOYEES WELFARE EXPENSE	33,985	3,906	2,931	4,855	4,855	4,855	4,855	4,855	6,855	4,855	4,855	4,855	86,516
16	926-3	EMPLOYEE INSURANCE BENEFITS	21,882	19,483	21,682	21,990	21,990	21,990	21,990	21,990	21,990	21,990	21,990	21,990	260,956
17	926-4	EMPLOYEE PENSIONS	47,790	47,790	47,790	51,900	51,900	51,900	51,900	51,900	51,900	51,900	51,900	51,900	610,470
18	926-5	EMPLOYEE POST RETIREMENT BEN	(09)	(09)	(09)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(20)	(630)
19	926-8	EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION THRIFT PL/	3,582	3,405	3,583	3,180	2,640	2,370	2,370	2,370	2,370	5,600	5,330	5,060	41,860
8	930-10	ADVERTISING													0
7	930-20	MISC. GENERAL EXPENSES	(62,485)	(88'388)	(93,342)	(112,932)	(108,737)	103,217)		(105,343)		(113,430)	(600'86)		1,211,409)
83	930-21	TRUSTEE & DIRECTOR FEES	1,740	0	0			6,740	10,000		6,740	4,200		6,740	36,160
53	931	RENTS													0
24	426-02	CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS													0
52	426.03	SERVICE CLUB DUES													0
56															ı
27	c	SUBTOTAL CORPORATE OFFICE	662,578	546,726	704,955	509,327	524,479	644,105	518,353	502,362	555,749	524,491	558,280	579,975	6,831,379
8 8	355		>	•	>				>	>	>				>
8		CORPORATE OFFICE OPERATIONS	662,578	546,726	704,955	509,327	524,479	644,105	518,353	502,362	555,749	524,491	558,280	579,975	6,831,379
91															

RFP No. 31: Referring to WPC-2.1b, for April through June 2013, please provide accounting records and other documents that detail the costs recorded in Account 923-2, "MGT. SUPV. FEES & EXPENSES".

RESPONSE: See "RFP No. 31.pdf," attached.

Aqua Ohio,inc Lake / Masury / Prior American Properties Case 13-2124-WW-AIR

OCC 4th Set RPD-31

	April 2013	May 2013	June 2013 6218 651 04
	\$136,220.00	\$106,028.34	\$195,436.28
Transfer Service Billing to CWIP	(\$17,259.52)	(\$15,398.28)	(\$24,293.32)
Total #923-2 Mgmt. Supv. Fees & Expenses	\$366,400.46	\$322,314.51	\$489,794.00

MOEX PAGE

OHIO SUNDRY EXPENSES June 2013

Last Name/Vendor	invoice Number	Date	Subsidiary	Amount	Acet Unit	Account	OHIO
Depreciation Accrual	3		PSC ALL UTIL	6.074.00	421	403010	970.62
BOD Restricted Stock ER Contribution Thritt P1	6 100014		PSC ALL UTIL PSC ALL UTIL	491,408.00 609.44	411 410	603841 604837	64,144.83 97.38
Unum CWC Referens	100012		PSC ALL CWG	30.98	410	604840	14.58
Business & Legal Resource	2	6/30/2013	PSC ALL UTIL	308.95	410	604845	49.37
Complianceonline	2		PEC ALL UTIL	349,0G	410	604846	55.77
ifebp	2		PSC ALL UTIL	00.00	410	604845	156.60
Okn 000000q6uj9astax Choice Streteoles	100003		PECALL UTIL	3,235.50 45.00	421 410	604845 604850	517.03 7.19
Choice Strategies	100003		PSC ALL UTIL	45.00	410	604850	7 19
Aqua Services Amentilex	6		PSC ALL UTIL	920.40	410	504850	147 08
Choice Strategies	100001	6/30/2013	PSC ALL UTIL	928.20	410	604850	148 33
Employment Background Inv	2		PSC OHIO	108.00	410	604852	108.00
Comprehensive Screening S Comprehensive Screening S	2		PSC OHIO PSC OHIO	117.45 121.20	410 410	604852 604852	117.45 121.20
Comprehensive Screening S	3		PSC OHIO	285.19	410	504852	285.19
Employment Background Inv	2		PSC OHIO	470.00	410	604852	470.00
fu Health Occ Serv Munuie	2		PSC ALL UTIL	25.00	410	604854	3,99
Employment Background Inv	2		PSC OHIO	135.00	410	604854 604856	136.00
American Welstworks 12928SALUDOS HISPANOS,INC.	2 265433		PSC ALL UTIL	249 00 595.00	410 410	604856 604856	39.79 95.08
42113DIVERSITYPENNSYLVANIA	109652		PSC ALL UTIL	2 782.50	410	604856	444.64
Www.Linkedin.Com	2		PSC ALL UTIL	3 632 00	410	604856	580 39
Carearbuilder	2		PSC ALL UTIL	3,740 00	410	604850	597 65
13099BLACK EQE JOURNAL	783		PSC ALL UTIL	4,000.00	410	604856	839,20
Fiorebistes Fruit Plowers Broomsti	2 2		PSC ALL UTIL PSC ALL UTIL	90.95 72.00	200 300	904857 604857	. 14.53 11.51
Fruit Flowers Broomali	2		PSC ALL UTIL	89.50	300	604B57	14.30
TOWERS PERRIN	100003		PSC ALL CWC	14,600 91	410	604864	6 869.73
40705EPICOR SOFTWARE CORPO	CIV0256592		PSC ALL UTIL	109.00	410	604864	15.98
Caridian Corp	2		PSC ALL UTIL	103.75	410	604864	16.5B
40705EPICOR SOFTWARE CORPO	CIV0257808 CIV0258743		PSC ALL UTIL	550.00	410 410	604864 604864	87.89
40705EPICOR SOFTWARE CORPO 42201JOAN WILLIAMS	6!013EXP		PSC ALL UTIL PSC ALL UTIL	1.350,00 1.586.04	410	604864	216.73 253.45
40914EQUILIBRIA LEADERSHIP	52113		PSC ALL UTIL	1,647 48	418	604864	263.27
TOWERS PERRIN	100003	6/30/2013	PSC ALL UTIL	3,000.63	410	804864	479.50
42722KELLY DAY	605138ERVICE		PSC ALL UTIL	7,785 30	410	604864	1,244.04
TOWERS PERRIN 19234BUCK CONSULTANTS, LLC	100003 2135963		PSC ALL UTIL PSC ALL UTIL	13,009 95 14,825,00	410 410	604884 604864	2,078.98 2,369.03
TOWERS PERRIN	100003		PSC ALL UTIL	15.532.56	410	604864	2,482 10
39234BUCK CONSULTANTS, LLC	2139649		PSC ALL UTIL	41,350.00	410	604864	6,607.71
TOWERS PERRIN	100003		PSC ALL UTIL	51,831.58	410	604684	8,282,66
40671FROSCH REWARDS & INCE	7872		ACO ALLOCATE	1.001.35	410	604866	162 52
40671FROSCH REWARDS & INCE 40671FROSCH REWARDS & INCE	7672 7872		PSC ALI. UTIL	3,162 95 5 993 78	410 410	604866 604866	505.44 5.993.79
Wellness Programs	100015		PSC ALL UTIL	(51,408.40)	410	804869	(8,215.04)
Bed Bath & Bayond #161	2		PSC ALL UTIL	3.37	416	604869	0.54
Homogoods #294	2		PSC ALL UTIL	15 88	410	804889	2.54
Staples 00117481	2		PSC ALL UTIL	21.77	410	604869	3,48
Superfresh #70189 Paypai	2 2		PSC ALL UTIL PSC ALL UTIL	23.06 26.14	410 410	604869 604869	3,68 4 18
Party City	2		PSC ALL UTIL	26.42	410	604869	4.22
Amz*webstaurantstore C	2		PSC ALL UTIL	28.04	410	604869	4.48
Bj Wholesale #0116	2		PSC ALL UTIL	29.22	410	604869	4,67
Glant 6464	2		PSC ALL UTIL	32.93	410	604869	5.26
42877SARA C APPLEBY Witholeids Pim 10249	52513EXP 2		PSC ALL UTIL	41.02 65.16	410 410	504869 504869	6 55 10 41
Tuesday Moming # 1047	2		PSC ALL UTIL	65.67	410	604869	10.49
Amazon.Com	2	6/30/2013	PSC ALL UTIL	70 22	410	604869	11 22
Amazon,Com	2		PSC ALL LITTL	70.23	410	604869	11 22
Paparstyle Com Chick-Fil-A #01218	2		PSC ALL UTR	116.10	410 410	604869 604869	18,55 19 16
Amazon,Com	2 2		PSC ALL UTIL PSC ALL UTIL	119.93 130.68	410 410	604869	19 16 20.68
Knoebels Park Office	2		PSC ALL UTIL	150,00	410	694869	23 97
Sephora Com	2		PSC ALL UTIL	159.00	410	604869	25.41
Sephora.Com	2		PSC ALL UTIL	159 00	410	604869	25 41
Hadeysville Rentatinc. Chick-F8-A #01215	2 2		PSC ALL UTIL	184.30 199.34	410 410	604869 604869	26 26 31 86
42328SAFEQUARO BUSINESS SY	24654		PSC ALL UTIL	249.92	410	604869	39 94
42328SAFEGUARD BUSINESS SY	28931540RPRNT		PSC ALL UTIL	300.72	410	604889	48 06
Dream Essentiate 60 Of 00	2		PSC ALL UTIL	316 00	410	604869	50 60
Courtyard By Marriott-Rail	2		PSC ALL UTIL	387 00	410	004869	61 84
423285AFEGUARD BUSINESS SY 423285AFFGUARD BUSINESS SY	28531538RPRN1 24653		PSC ALL UTIL PSC ALL UTIL	428.03 457.86	410 410	604869 604889	68 40 72 33
423285AFFGUAPU BUSINESS SY 41185FIT ESSENTIALS INC	24653 8870		PSCALLUIIL	457.56 465.00	419	604869	72.33 74.31
42328SAFEGUARO BUSINESS SY	28931544RPRNT		PSC ALL UTIL	512 97	410	604869	81.97
41 (85FIT ESSENTIALS INC	8873	5/30/2013	PSC ALL UTIL	610 00	410	604869	97.48
41321ALERE WELLBEING INC	33483		PSC ALL UTIL	750 00	410	604869	119.85
423285AFEGUARD BUGINESS SY 41185FIT ESSENTIALS INC	28931539RPRN1 8869		PSC ALL UTIL	1 109 90 3,800.00	410 410	604869 604869	177,36 575.28
40516RR DONNELLEY	1253840400		PSC ALL UTIL	3,000.00 277 00	320	632800	373 28 44 26
37949MARTIN P GERSHKITWITZ	6713		PSG ALL UTIL	601 66	330	632800	80 16

Hines, Steven

From: Saluga, Stephen J. <SJSaluga@aquaamerica.com>

Sent: Friday, January 17, 2014 4:38 PM

To: Willis, William

Cc: Drumm, Jane; 'Andrew Campbell'; Hines, Steven

Subject: FW: Allocation Factors DR #8 Due 1/15/14 Case 13-2124-WW-AIR

Attachments: Response to DR #8.pdf

PUCO DR#8

Please provide the Staff with a detailed supporting schedule showing allocation factors used and the methodology to allocate corporate office expenses, customer accounting expenses, and any other common administrative and general expenses to the jurisdictional test year. Thank you.

Aqua Ohio Response

Attached is the Aqua Ohio response to PUCO DR #8- Allocation Factors.

From: Hideg, Richard A.

Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2014 1:39 PM

To: Saluga, Stephen J. **Cc:** Martin, Elaine J.

Subject: FW: Allocation Factors DR #8 Due 1/15/14

From: Willis, Ross [mailto:Ross.Willis@puc.state.oh.us]

Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2014 1:23 PM **To:** Hideg, Richard A.; Kopas, Robert A. **Cc:** PUCO Agua Ohio 13-2124-WW-AIR

Subject: Allocation Factors DR #8 Due 1/15/14

Please provide the Staff with a detailed supporting schedule showing allocation factors used and the methodology to allocate corporate office expenses, customer accounting expenses, and any other common administrative and general expenses to the jurisdictional test year. Thank you.

Wm. Ross Willis

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Chief, Rates Division Utilities Department (614) 466-8040 PUCO.ohio.gov

Saluga, Stephen J.

Subject:

FW: Allocation Factors DR #8 Due 1/15/14

From: Hideg, Richard A.

Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2014 1:39 PM

To: Saluga, Stephen J. **Cc:** Martin, Elaine J.

Subject: FW: Allocation Factors DR #8 Due 1/15/14

From: Willis, Ross [mailto:Ross.Willis@puc.state.oh.us]

Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2014 1:23 PM **To:** Hideg, Richard A.; Kopas, Robert A. **Cc:** PUCO Agua Ohio 13-2124-WW-AIR

Subject: Allocation Factors DR #8 Due 1/15/14

Please provide the Staff with a detailed supporting schedule showing allocation factors used and the methodology to allocate corporate office expenses, customer accounting expenses, and any other common administrative and general expenses to the jurisdictional test year. Thank you.

Wm. Ross Willis

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Chief, Rates Division Utilities Department (614) 466-8040 PUCO.ohio.gov



The major allocation for Tu socice center allocation and customer accounting expenses and attached. Any additional support for other allocations in the case will be provided as reeded.

AQUA OHIO. INC ADMINISTRATIVE & GENERAL EXPENSES ALLOCATION 2013 ALLOCATION %'s BASED ON DATA as of 12/31/12 - Use to Allocate Service Center for '13

					38.486%											61.514%	100.000%
ALLOCATION	PERCENT	22.794%	12.491%	3.200%	. "	20.083%	0.501%	11.563%	14.478%	6.171%	5.728%	0.945%	0.285%	0.157%	1.604%		100.000%
TOTAL	%; <u>%</u>	79.78%	43.72%	11.20%		70.29%	1.75%	40.47%	50.67%	21.60%	20.05%	3.31%	1.00%	0.55%	5.61%		350.00%
ENUE 50%)	81	10.85%	6.48%	2.13%		9.34%	0.45%	5.45%	7.67%	2.78%	2.90%	0.42%	0.29%	0.13%	1.10%		50.00%
TOTAL REVENUE (WEIGHTED 50%)	AMOUNT	20,266,703	12,113,726	3,988,286		17,443,345	842,734	10,184,559	14,337,022	5,195,347	5,418,512	779,028	547,341	250,844	2,052,528		93,419,975
MERS ED 50%)	% !	12.08%	6.52%	2.23%		10.94%	0.51%	4.35%	5.91%	2.67%	2.72%	0.46%	0.31%	0.14%	1.17%		50.00%
CUSTOMERS (WEIGHTED 50%)	NUMBER	35,592	19,204	6.573		32,230	1,491	12,809	17,404	7,856	8,003	1,368	908	422	3,448		147,305
EATED ID 50%)	% 1	12.95%	5.88%	0.00%		10.77%	0.00%	7.27%	8.48%	2.25%	2.13%	0.27%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		50.00%
WATER TREATED (WEIGHTED 50%)	MG	3,476.00	1,578.60			2,890.10 10.77%	•	1,950.00	2,274.90	602.80	571.60	71.70	Ī	İ	1		13,415.70 50.00%
AYROLL ED 50%)	% !	8.59%	6.55%	1.64%		8.49%	0.00%	7.41%	7.59%	4.29%	3.79%	0.69%	0.07%	0.00%	0.87%		50.00%
GROSS PAYROLL (WEIGHTED 50%)	NUMBER	1,705,876	1,301,403	326,359		1,685,927	•	1,471,934	1,508,190	852,644	753,241	136,646	13,290	ı	173,428		9,928,938 50.00%
YEES ED 50%)	84	8.64%	6.48%	1.23%		8.33%	0.00%	7.10%	7.72%	4.63%	4.32%	0.62%	0.00%	0.00%	0.93%		162 50.00%
(WEIGHTED 50%)	NUMBER	28	21	4	ate case	27	•	23	25	15	4	2	•	,	m		162
ΛiP	3 81	26.66%	11.80%	3.96%	han in the r	22.42%	0.80%	8.89%	13.30%	4.98%	4.19%	0.85%	0.33%	0.27%	1.55%	rate case	100.00%
PLANT & CWIP	AMOUNT	119,352,031.02	52,816,560.96	17,709,640.25	Allocation percent to divisions other than in the rate case	100,354,704.10 Auburn, Ashtabula)	3,561,522.44	39,806,541.90	59,538,172.02	22,290,774.67	18,748,454.95	3,817,361.74	1,482,894.52	1,217,966.73	6,919,649.55	Allocation precent to divisions in the rate case	447,616,274.85
DISTRICT		STARK	STRUTHERS	FRANKLIN - Sewer	Allocation per	LAKE SHORE - LAKE 100,354,704 (Includes Sub. Norlick, Seneca, Auburn, Ashtabula)	MASURY	ASHTABULA	MARION	TIFFIN	FRANKLIN - Water	MANSFIELD	PORTAGE	LAKE WHITE	LAWRENCE COUNTY	Allocation pre	TOTAL

AQUA OHIO, INC.
CUSTOMOER ACCOUNTING EXPENSE ALLOCATION
2013 ALLOCATION %'s
BASED ON DATA as of 12/31/12 - Use to Allocate '13

USED FOR CALL CENTER COSTS

CUSTOMERS

				41.66%
%	24.16%	13.04%	4.462%	
NUMBER	35,592	r only 19,204	6,573	Allocation to divisions not in the rate case
		Wate	ewer	ion to d
	STARK	STRUTHERS	FRANKLIN - Se	Allocat
	NUMBER %	<u>NUMBER</u> 35,592	NUMBER 35,592 HERS Water only 19,204	NUMBER 35,592 HERS Water only 19,204 LIN - Sewer 6,573

21.88%	1.012%	8.70%	11.81%	5.33%	5.43%	0.93%	0.61%	0.29%	2.34%
JAKE SHORE - LAKE (Includes Sub, Norlick, Seneca, Auburn, Ashtabula)	1,491	12,809	17,404	7,856	8,003	1,368	908	422	3,448
LAKE SHORE - LAKE (Includes Sub, Norlick	MASURY	ASHTABULA	MARION	TIFFIN	FRANKLIN - Water	MANSFIELD	PORTAGE	LAKE WHITE	LAWRENCE COUNTY

58.34%

100.00%

100.00%

147,305

TOTAL

Allocation to divisions in the rate case

AQUA OHIO, INC. CUSTOMOER ACCOUNTING EXPENSE ALLOCATION 2013 ALLOCATION %'s BASED ON DATA as of 12/31/12 - Use to Allocate '13

USED FOR BILLING PROCESSING

CUSTOMERS

	DISTRICT			
		NUMBER	%	
STARK	Includes Firestone Trace & Sites Lake	35,823	24.25%	
STRUTHERS	Includes water & Sewer	38,408	26.00%	
FRANKLIN - Sewer	ewer	6,573	4.45%	
Allocal	Allocation to divisions not in the rate case	ate case		54.71%
LAKE SHORE - LAKE (Includes Sub, Norlick	32,230 (Includes Sub, Norlick, Seneca, Aubum, Ashtabula)	32,230 Ashtabula)	21.82%	
MASURY		1,491	1.01%	
ASHTABULA	*half since bi-monthly	6,405	4.34%	
MARION	*half since bi-monthly	8,702	5.89%	
TIFFIN	*half since bi-monthly	3,928	2.66%	
FRANKLIN - Water	ater	8,003	5.42%	
MANSFIELD		1,368	0.93%	
PORTAGE		905	0.61%	
LAKE WHITE		422	0.29%	
LAWRENCE COUNTY	YTNDO	3,448	2.33%	
Allocat	Allocation to divisions in the rate case	case		45.29%

*The allocation for the billing process is calculated based on a bi-monthly billing cycle for the divisions of Ashtabula, Marion, and Tiffin in the Prior American Properties. Effective December 2013 all of these divisions were on a monthly billing cycle.

147,706 100.00%

TOTAL

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

8/4/2014 4:30:25 PM

in

Case No(s). 13-2124-WW-AIR

Summary: Testimony Testimony of Steven B. Hines in Opposition to the Stipulation and Recommendation on Behalf of the Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel electronically filed by Ms. Deb J. Bingham on behalf of Yost, Melissa R. Ms.