

E-FILED

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Commonwealth Keystone Building 400 North Street Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (Water & Wastewater) / Petition of the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority for Waiver of Provisions of Act 11 to Increase the DSIC CAP, to Permit Levelization of DSIC Charges, and to Authorize the Pay-As-You-Go Method of Financing / Docket Nos. R-2020-3017951, R-2020-3017970, P-2020-3019019

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find the Answer and Verification, on behalf of the Office of Small Business Advocate ("OSBA"), in the above-captioned proceeding.

Copies will be served on all known parties in this proceeding, as indicated on the attached Certificate of Service.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Daniel G. Asmus

Assistant Small Business Advocate

Attorney ID No. 83789

Enclosures

cc: Brian Kalcic

Parties of Record

Petition of the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority for Waiver of Provisions of Act 11 to Increase the DSIC CAP, to Permit Levelization of DSIC Charges, and to Authorize the Pay-As-You-Go Method of Financing

Docket No. P-2020-3019019

:

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

v.

Docket Nos. R-2020-3017951

R-2020-3017970

Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (Water & Wastewater)

ANSWER OF THE OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCATE
TO PETITION OF THE PITTSBURGH WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY
TO CONSOLIDATE DSIC PETITION WITH BASE RATE CASE FILINGS FOR BOTH
WATER AND WASTEWATER CONVEYANCE

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.61(e), the Office of Small Business Advocate ("OSBA") hereby answers the Petition of the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority ("PWSA" or "the Company") to Consolidate DSIC Petition With Base Rate Case Filings for Both Water and Wastewater Conveyance ("Petition") filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission ("Commission") on March 6, 2020, and avers the following in support thereof:

The OSBA is an agency of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania authorized by the Small Business Advocate Act (Act 181 of 1988, 73 P.S. §§ 399.41 - 399.50) to represent the interest of small business consumers as a party in proceedings before the Commission.

In the Petition, the Company seeks Commission approval to consolidate its previously filed Petition to waive the DSIC CAP filed at Docket No. P-2020-3019019 with the base rate filings for Water and Wastewater at R-2020-3017951 (Water) and R-2020-3017970 (Wastewater). It should be noted that PWSA has also filed petitions to consolidate the water and wastewater filings. In answer to the paragraphs of PWSA's Petition, the OSBA avers as follows:

The first unnumbered paragraph of PWSA's Petition constitutes a prayer for relief and as such, no response is necessary.

I. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

- 1. Admitted in part. The averments in the first sentence of this paragraph are admitted. The averments of the second sentence of this paragraph constitute a prayer for relief, to which no response is necessary.
- 2. The averments of this paragraph constitute a prayer for relief, to which no response is necessary.
- 3. Admitted.

II. Request for Consolidation of Proceedings

- 4. The averments of this paragraph constitute a prayer for relief, to which no response is necessary.
- 5. Section 5.81(a) of the Commission's regulations, being a writing, speaks for itself, and therefore no response is necessary.
- 6. The averments of this paragraph paraphrase eight issues to be considered when evaluating a petition for consolidation, as set forth in a second prehearing order entered November 26, 2012 in *Pub. Util. Comm'n v. City of Lancaster Sewer Fund*, Docket No. R-2012-2310366. While the second prehearing order in that proceeding does address the issues to be considered in a consolidation, the language comes from an analysis of other caselaw, as fully quoted from the second prehearing order:

In considering the consolidation of cases, the first criteria (set forth in the Commission's regulations) is that the proceedings must involve "a

common question of law or fact". An examination of Commission precedent in such cases as *Applications of Philadelphia Electric Co.*, 43 Pa. PUC 781 (1968), *Pa. Public Utility Comm'n v. Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania*, 46 Pa. PUC 568 (1973), and *Pa. Public Utility Comm'n v. Butler Twp. Water Co.*, 52 Pa. PUC 442 (1978), as well as those cited above, establishes that considerations in addition to the presence of common questions of law or fact must also be evaluated in ruling on a consolidation. These other considerations are:

- 1. Will the presence of additional issues cloud a determination of the common issues?
- 2. Will consolidation result in reduced costs of litigation and decision-making for the parties and the Commission?
- 3. Do issues in one proceeding go to the heart of an issue in the other proceeding?
- 4. Will consolidation unduly protract the hearing, or produce a disorderly and unwieldy record?
- 5. Will different statutory and legal issues be involved?
- 7. Will consolidation unduly delay the resolution of one of the proceedings?
- 8. Will supporting data in both proceedings be repetitive?

No single consideration, nor group of these considerations, is dispositive of a consolidation, any more so than the presence of a common question of law or fact. Rather, the evaluation of all of them and a balancing of those favoring and disfavoring consolidation is required.1

- 7. The averments of this paragraph constitute a prayer for relief, to which no response is necessary. To the extent that these averments state conclusions of law, no response is necessary.
- 8. The averments of this paragraph state conclusions of law to which no response is necessary.
- 9. The averments of this paragraph state conclusions of law to which no response is necessary.
- 10. The averments of this paragraph state conclusions of law to which no response is necessary.

¹ Pub. Util. Comm'n v. City of Lancaster Sewer Fund, Docket No. R-2012-2310366 (Second Prehearing Order entered November 26, 2012) at 3-4.

11. The averments of this paragraph state conclusions of law, to which no response is necessary.

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, the Office of Small Business Advocate respectfully requests that the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission:

- i. Direct the Office of Administrative Law Judge to hold hearings on the Petition and prepare an initial decision.
- ii. Deny approval of PWSA's Petition unless it is found to be reasonable and equitable to small business customers;
 - iii. Grant such other relief as may be necessary or appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Sharon E. Webb, Attorney ID No. 73995 Erin K. Fure, Attorney ID No. 312245

Daniel G. Asmus, Attorney ID No. 83789 Assistant Small Business Advocates

Office of Small Business Advocate Forum Place 555 Walnut St., 1st Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101 (717) 783-2525 (717) 783-2831

Date: March 26, 2020

VERIFICATION

I, John R. Evans, hereby state that the facts set forth herein above are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief and that I expect to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).

Date: 03/26/20

(Signature)

Petition of the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority for Waiver of Provisions of Act 11 to Increase the DSIC CAP, to Permit Levelization of DSIC Charges, and to Authorize the Pay-As-You-Go Method of Financing

:

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission

Docket Nos. R-2020-3017951 R-2020-3017970

Docket No. P-2020-3019019

Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (Water & Wastewater)

 \mathbf{v} .

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of the foregoing have been served via email (*unless other noted below*) upon the following persons, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

Christine M. Hoover, Esquire
Erin L. Gannon, Esquire
Lauren E. Guerra, Esquire
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
choover@paoca.org
egannon@paoca.org
lguerra@paoca.org
(Counsel for OCA)

Gina L. Miller, Esquire
John M. Coogan, Esquire
Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement
400 North Street
Commonwealth Keystone Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120
ginmiller@pa.gov
jcoogan@pa.gov
(Counsel for BIE)

Daniel Clearfield, Esquire
Deanne M. O'Dell, Esquire
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101
dclearfield@eckertseamans.com
dodell@eckertseamans.com
(Counsel for PWSA)

Elizabeth R. Marx, Esquire
John W. Sweet, Esquire
Patrick M. Cicero, Esquire
Pennsylvania Utility Law Project
118 Locust Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
pulp@palegalaid.net

The Honorable Charles E. Rainey Jr. Chief Administrative Law Judge Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission 400 North Street Commonwealth Keystone Building Harrisburg, PA 17120 crainey@pa.gov

Dimple Chaudhary, Esquire
Peter J. DeMarco, Esquire
Cecilia Segal, Esquire
Natural Resources Defense Council
1152 15th Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005
dchaudhary@nrdc.org
pdemarco@nrdc.org
csegal@nrdc.org

Michael A. Gruin, Esquire Stevens & Lee 17 North Second Street, 16th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101 mag@stevenslee.com (Counsel for PAWC)

DATE: March 26, 2020

Daniel G. Asmus

Assistant Small Business Advocate

Attorney ID No. 83789