



September 7, 2021

VIA E-File

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
400 North Street, Filing Room
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: PA Public Utility Commission v. Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority
Docket Nos. R-2021-3024773, R-2021-3024774, R-2021-3024779

Dear Secretary Chiavetta,

In accordance with 52 Pa. Code § 5.412a and the Post-Hearing Order and Errata entered August 17, 2021 and August 18, 2021, attached hereto, please accept for filing **Pittsburgh United St. No. 1-SR - Surrebuttal Testimony of Harry Geller** that was duly admitted into the record at the hearing held in the above-captioned proceeding on August 13, 2021, before Administrative Law Judge Eranda Vero.

A copy of this letter is being served on ALJ Vero and the parties of record consistent with the attached Certificate of Service. Please contact me with any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Ria M. Pereira".

Ria M. Pereira, Esq.
Counsel for Pittsburgh United

CC: Certificate of Service (Cover Letter/ COS only)
Honorable Eranda Vero (Cover Letter/ COS only)
Pamela McNeal, pmcneal@pa.gov (Cover Letter/ COS only)

Enclosures.

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket Nos. R-2021-3024773
	:	R-2021-3024774
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority	:	R-2021-3024779
	:	

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify I have on this day served copies of **Compliance Filing, 52 Pa. Code § 5.412a, Pittsburgh United Statement 1-SR**, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a party) and consistent with the Commission’s Emergency Order issued on March 20, 2020, in the manner and upon the persons listed below.

VIA EMAIL ONLY

<p>Daniel Clearfield, Esq. Deanne M. O'Dell, Esq. Karen Moury, Esq. Lauren M. Burge, Esquire Sarah Stoner, Esq. Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC 213 Market Street, 8th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101 dodell@eckertseamans.com dclearfield@eckertseamans.com kmoury@eckertseamans.com lburge@eckertseamans.com SStoner@eckertseamans.com</p>	<p>Teresa Reed Wagner Erin Fure, Esq. Office of Small Business Advocate Forum Place 555 Walnut Street, 1st Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101 tereswagne@pa.gov efure@pa.gov</p>
<p>Gina L. Miller, Esq. Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement Commonwealth Keystone Building 400 North Street, 2nd Floor Harrisburg, PA 17120 ginmiller@pa.gov</p>	<p>Christine M. Hoover, Esq. Erin L. Gannon, Esq. Lauren E. Guerra, Esq. Office of Consumer Advocate 555 Walnut Street 5th Floor, Forum Place Harrisburg, PA 17101 choover@paoca.org lguerra@paoca.org egannon@paoca.org OCAPWSA2021@paoca.org</p>

<p>Yvonne Hilton, Esq. John F. Doherty, Esq. Lawrence H. Baumiller, Esq. City of Pittsburgh Department of Law 313 City-County Building 414 Grant Street Pittsburgh, PA 15219 yvonne.hilton@pittsburghpa.gov john.doherty@pittsburghpa.gov lawrence.baumiller@pittsburghpa.gov</p>	<p>Whitney E. Snyder, Esq. Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. Thomas J. Sniscak, Esq. Hawke McKeon and Sniscak, LLP 100 N. 10th Street Harrisburg, PA 17101 wesnyder@hmslegal.com kjmckeon@hmslegal.com tjsniscak@hmslegal.com</p>
<p>Peter J. DeMarco, Esq. Natural Resources Defense Council 1152 15th Street NW, Ste. 300 Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: 202-289-2385 pdemarco@nrdc.org</p>	<p>Jared J. Thompson, Esq. Natural Resources Defense Council 1152 15th Street NW, Ste. 300 Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: (202) 513-6249 jared.thompson@nrdc.org</p>
<p>Brian Kalcic Excel Consulting 225 S. Meramec Avenue, Suite 720T St. Louis, MO 63105 excel.consulting@sbcglobal.net</p>	<p>Administrative Law Judge Eranda Vero 801 Market Street Suite 4063 Philadelphia, PA 19107 evero@pa.gov cc: Pamela McNeal, pmcneal@pa.gov</p>

Respectfully submitted,
PENNSYLVANIA UTILITY LAW PROJECT
Counsel for Pittsburgh United



Ria M. Pereira, PA ID 316771
118 Locust Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101
717-236-9486 / pulp@pautilitylawproject.org

Date: September 7, 2021

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission :
:
v. : **Docket Nos.** **R-2021-3024773**
: **R-2021-3024774**
: **R-2021-3024779**
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority :

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF HARRY GELLER, ESQ.
ON BEHALF OF
PITTSBURGH UNITED

August 6, 2021

Topics Addressed:

Rate Affordability / Rate Impact on Low Income Consumers

Low Income Programming

1 **PREPARED SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF HARRY GELLER, ESQ.**

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 **Q: Please state your name, occupation, and business address.**

4 A: My name is Harry Geller. I am an attorney. I am the former Director of the Pennsylvania
5 Utility Law Project. I am currently retired but serve as Senior Counsel to the Pennsylvania Utility
6 Law Project (PULP) and as a consultant to legal aid programs and their clients. I maintain an office
7 at 118 Locust St., Harrisburg, PA 17101.

8 **Q: Did you previously submit testimony in this proceeding?**

9 A: Yes. I submitted direct testimony, pre-marked as Pittsburgh United Statement 1 and
10 rebuttal testimony, pre-marked as Pittsburgh United Statement 1-R.

11 **Q: What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?**

12 A: My surrebuttal testimony responds to the rebuttal testimony of Pittsburgh Water and Sewer
13 Authority's (PWSA) expert witness Julie A. Quigley. My surrebuttal is not intended to address
14 every issue raised or otherwise discussed by PWSA's expert witnesses or any witness's rebuttal
15 testimony. Absence of a response to any specific recommendation or position of any witness does
16 not indicate my agreement. Unless required for context in providing further responses to rebuttal
17 testimony, I will not reiterate the extensive arguments and evidence that I have provided through
18 by direct testimony and rebuttal testimony. To the extent an argument raised by any party in
19 rebuttal is already sufficiently addressed in my direct testimony or rebuttal testimony, I do not
20 intend to respond, and stand by the evaluations, analyses, and recommendations contained in by
21 direct testimony and rebuttal testimony.

1 **Q: How is your surrebuttal testimony organized?**

2 A: I will address the rebuttal testimony of PWSA expert witness Ms. Julie Quigley (PWSA
3 Statement 6-R) as follows:

- 4 1. I will respond to Ms. Quigley's rebuttal testimony related to recommendations set forth in
5 OCA expert witness Roger Colton's direct testimony, related to providing additional terms
6 and processes for payment arrangements as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 7 2. I will address Ms. Quigley's rebuttal testimony of analyses conducted by Mr. Colton and
8 myself related to PWSA's low enrollment levels in PWSA's low income assistance
9 programs.
- 10 3. I will respond to Ms. Quigley's rebuttal testimony related to Mr. Colton and my
11 recommendations related to improved data tracking of PWSA's low income assistance
12 programs.
- 13 4. I will address Ms. Quigley's rebuttal testimony related to the affordability of rates for
14 PWSA's low income customers and the purpose of PWSA's low income programs.
- 15 5. I will respond to Ms. Quigley's rebuttal testimony related to Mr. Colton and my
16 recommendations to improve the structure of PWSA's Pilot Arrearage Forgiveness
17 Program (PAFP).
- 18 6. I will respond to Ms. Quigley's rebuttal testimony to my recommendations on restructuring
19 the Bill Discount Program (BDP) to provide improved affordability to PWSA's low
20 income BDP participants.

1 **II. ADDITIONAL PAYMENT ARRANGEMENT TERMS**

2 **Q: Please summarize OCA expert witness Roger Colton’s recommendations regarding**
3 **payment arrangement terms as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?**

4 A: In his direct testimony, OCA expert witness, Mr. Roger Colton, recommends
5 implementation of the following payment arrangement process as a result of COVID-19 for one
6 year from the date of the final order in this case, or until January 12, 2022, whichever is later:¹

- 7 • Customers will be offered at least one payment arrangement consistent with
8 the term length identified in 66 Pa. C.S. § 1405, except that customers
9 between 250-300% FPL will be offered payment arrangements of no less
10 than 24 months; those customers over 300% of the Federal Poverty Level
11 will be offered a payment arrangement of no less than twelve months in
12 length, if warranted based on the customers’ facts and circumstances,
13 including their ability to pay regardless of the number of prior arrangements
14 or prior broken payment arrangements on their accounts.
- 15 • Victims of domestic violence with a Protection from Abuse Order or other
16 court order which contains clear evidence of domestic violence will be
17 offered a payment arrangement that exceeds the term lengths identified in
18 66 Pa. C.S. § 1405 if warranted based on the customers’ facts and
19 circumstances, including their ability to pay.

20 Additionally, Mr. Colton recommends targeted outreach to customers with existing debt to
21 negotiate appropriate payment arrangements and/or enroll these customers in low income
22 assistance programs.²

23 **Q: Do you support Mr. Colton’s recommendations for expanded payment arrangement**
24 **terms as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?**

25 A: Yes. As I discussed in my direct testimony, low income households have experienced
26 disproportionate levels of health and economic harm – including greater job and wage losses,

¹ OCA St. 4 at 20-21.

² Id. at 20.

1 increased food insecurity, and accrual of unprecedented levels of debt for life’s basic necessities.³
2 In addition to the recommendations in my direct testimony to provide immediate assistance in light
3 of the COVID-19 pandemic, I support Mr. Colton’s recommendations related to additional
4 payment arrangement terms. Mr. Colton’s recommendations of additional payment arrangement
5 terms will help customers access additional measures to stay connected to basic water and
6 wastewater services. Affording customers additional flexibility for payment arrangements is
7 especially pressing given the uncertainty of economic recovery and increasing rates of COVID-19
8 across the country and within Pennsylvania in recent weeks.

9 **Q: Please summarize Ms. Quigley’s rebuttal testimony regarding Mr. Colton’s payment**
10 **arrangement recommendations to which you wish to respond.**

11 A: Ms. Quigley argues that providing additional payment arrangement flexibility will be
12 costly and time-consuming.⁴ Ms. Quigley also indicates that she has been advised by counsel for
13 PWSA that the Commission’s Order on July 15, 2021 may prevent PWSA from offering payment
14 arrangements not specifically allowed under Chapter 14.⁵ In support of this contention, Ms.
15 Quigley cites the Commission’s July 15 Order, which states in relevant part that “[a]fter September
16 30, 2021, payment arrangements must adhere to the provisions of the Public Utility Code and
17 Commission regulations.”⁶

18 **Q: How do you respond to Ms. Quigley’s argument that PWSA cannot offer more**
19 **flexible payment arrangements?**

³ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 8.

⁴ PWSA St. 6-R at 63: 6-14.

⁵ Id. at 63: 15-24.

⁶ Id. at 63: 18-21, citing Public Utility Service Termination Moratorium; COVID-19 Cost Tracking and Creation of Regulatory Asset, Order, Docket Nos. M-2020-3019244; M-2020-3019775, at 3 (Order entered July 15, 2021).

1 A: I am advised by counsel for Pittsburgh United that the effect of the Commission’s July 15th
2 Order is a legal question which counsel for Pittsburgh United reserves the right to address in
3 briefing.

4 **III. ENROLLMENT LEVELS OF PWSA’S LOW INCOME PROGRAMS**

5 **Q: Please summarize Ms. Quigley’s rebuttal testimony regarding the enrollment levels**
6 **in PWSA’s low income programs to which you wish to respond.**

7 A: Ms. Quigley agrees with Mr. Colton and me that there are likely more low income
8 customers in PWSA’s service territory than are enrolling in PWSA’s low income customer
9 assistance programs.⁷ However, Ms. Quigley denies that this is an issue requiring remediation.⁸
10 Ms. Quigley explains that other regulated utilities commonly face this issue, and points to a
11 Recommended Decision in Pennsylvania American Water Company’s (PAWC) recent rate
12 proceeding.⁹ Ms. Quigley claims that, despite OCA’s claim that only 16.7% of PAWC’s income-
13 eligible customers were enrolled in PAWC’s low income assistance programs, the ALJ found that
14 PAWC already had extensive community and customer outreach and denied OCA’s
15 recommendation that PAWC hire an independent expert to develop an outreach plan.¹⁰

⁷ PWSA St. 6-R at 72: 4-19.

⁸ Id.

⁹ Id.

¹⁰ Id. at 72: 4-19. PA PUC, et. al. v. PAWC, Opinion and Order, Docket Nos. R-2020-3019369, et. al., (Opinion and Order Feb. 25, 2021).

1 **Q: What is your response to Ms. Quigley’s assertion that PWSA’s enrollment levels do**
2 **not require improvement?**

3 A: Counsel for Pittsburgh United has advised me that it reserves the right to address any legal
4 issues as to the precedential value or weight of past Commission decisions through briefing. While
5 I do not offer a legal opinion on this issue, I note that Recommended Decisions and Commission
6 Orders are highly fact-dependent. I also note that failure of other regulated utilities to properly
7 reach meaningful numbers of their low income customers should not excuse PWSA from making
8 critical improvements to the enrollment levels of its low income assistance program. In my direct
9 testimony, I examined the many relevant factors to a determination in this case, including the
10 frequency and pace at which PWSA has increased rates in recent years, the concentrated poverty
11 rates in PWSA’s service territory, and the inadequacy in the administration and design of PWSA’s
12 programs.¹¹ Given the pervasive and growing rate of water and wastewater unaffordability faced
13 by PWSA’s most vulnerable customers, in the context of rapidly rising rates, PWSA should be
14 required to take immediate and affirmative action, as outlined in my direct testimony, to improve
15 the enrollment levels in its low income assistance programs.

16 **IV. DATA TRACKING OF PWSA’S LOW INCOME ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

17 **Q: Please summarize Ms. Quigley’s rebuttal testimony in response to your**
18 **recommendation that PWSA include enrollment data at each Low Income Assistance**
19 **Advisory Committee (LIAAC) meeting.**

20 A: In my direct testimony, I recommended that PWSA begin reporting on low income
21 program participation at LIAAC meetings to improve engagement from community members and

¹¹ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 14: 11-18; 10: 5-15; 29-47.

1 social service providers and to help PWSA to improve of the accuracy and consistency of its low
2 income program data.¹² Ms. Quigley argues that, while she has provided intermittent information
3 about enrollment data to the LIAAC as required by PWSA’s other agreed-to commitments, she
4 does not support a requirement that PWSA regularly provide this information.¹³ Ms. Quigley
5 explains that she spends “a significant amount of time” on LIAAC, and that LIAAC members
6 “may or may not find [this information] of interest”.¹⁴

7 **Q: What is your response to Ms. Quigley’s argument that PWSA should not be required**
8 **to provide low income assistance program enrollment data to the LIAAC?**

9 A: Like Ms. Quigley, I believe that the LIAAC should be provided with useful information
10 to fully engage the LIAAC and solicit valuable feedback. Enrollment and participation data of
11 PWSA’s low income assistance programs are key metrics to gauge whether PWSA’s low income
12 assistance programs are adequately meeting the needs of the communities that PWSA serves.
13 While parties can intermittently examine these program metrics through rate cases, community
14 members and other stakeholders should be provided with program data to allow them to provide
15 PWSA consistent feedback about PWSA’s low income programs. In my experience, other
16 regulated utilities regularly provide enrollment and participation data for their low income
17 assistance programs through their respective advisory groups. Far from not being of interest to
18 advisory group members, it is my experience that being provided this information allows advisory
19 groups to be engaged and act as a critical source of feedback. I note that pulling data more
20 frequently to share with the LIAAC will help improve some of PWSA’s other data challenges,
21 helping to create consistent data management processes and ensuring greater consistency in

¹² Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 35; 16; United Exhibits 1-a, 1-b, and 1-c.

¹³ PWSA St. 6-R at 79: 18 – 80: 8.

¹⁴ Id. at 80: 4-8.

1 reported information.¹⁵ It will also help to ensure that PWSA is tracking enrollment trends more
2 closely – allowing for adjustments and corrections to program administration, which has also
3 proven challenging for PWSA.¹⁶

4 **V. RATE AFFORDABILITY FOR LOW INCOME CUSTOMERS**

5 **Q: Please describe Ms. Quigley’s rebuttal testimony regarding the affordability of**
6 **PWSA’s water and wastewater rates for low income customers.**

7 A: Ms. Quigley denies the premise of my conclusion that “PWSA’s current rates are already
8 unaffordable” and that PWSA must make critical improvements to remediate the increasing
9 unaffordability if PWSA’s rate proposal is granted.¹⁷ Similarly, Ms. Quigley refutes Mr. Colton’s
10 assumption that low income assistance programs are intended to ensure that PWSA’s “water rates
11 remain affordable notwithstanding the rate increase proposed in this proceeding.”¹⁸ Ms. Quigley
12 explains that she did not state in her direct testimony that PWSA’s low income customers would
13 be able to afford the proposed rate changes, but rather that the low income customer assistance
14 programs act as mitigation measures along with other forms of customer assistance.¹⁹ Ms. Quigley
15 argues that the purpose of low income programming is to provide appropriate and reasonable
16 financial assistance to at-need customers, while considering the cost impacts on other ratepayers

¹⁵ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 30-35.

¹⁶ Id.

¹⁷ PWSA St. 6-R at 69.

¹⁸ Id.; OCA St. 4 at 6.

¹⁹ PWSA St. 6-R at 69: 1-18.

1 and pressures to collect revenues.²⁰ Ms. Quigley also argues that both Mr. Colton and I
2 acknowledged that what is “affordable” is difficult to determine.²¹

3 From Ms. Quigley’s perspective, PWSA’s Bill Discount Program is relatively new and
4 major program changes should be approached with caution and after a cost-benefit analysis.²² Ms.
5 Quigley argues that, without “clear regulatory direction (as the Commission has provided to
6 electric and gas distribution companies) on what is affordable in this context,” PWSA should focus
7 on balancing providing reasonable financial assistance with PWSA’s need to receive revenues.²³
8 According to Ms. Quigley, PWSA has provided reasonable financial assistance to its low income
9 customers and has been informed by several sources, including a Household Affordability
10 Analysis conducted in December 2019.²⁴

11 **Q: How do you respond to Ms. Quigley’s rebuttal testimony regarding the purpose of**
12 **low income assistance programs?**

13 A: I disagree with Ms. Quigley that low income assistance programs are not meant to provide
14 affordable rates of service to low income customers. I recognize that to date the Commission has
15 not provided any formal statewide guidance about affordability of water and wastewater rates
16 throughout the Commonwealth. Pursuant to the Joint Settlement in PWSA’s last rate proceeding,
17 PWSA agreed – in conjunction with OCA and low income stakeholders – to request that the
18 Commission, “as part of the condition of the Settlement, initiate a proceeding to consider whether

²⁰ Id. at 70: 1-17.

²¹ Id. at 70: 8-13.

²² Id. at 65: 23-26.

²³ Id. at 70: 13-17.

²⁴ Id. at 76: 4-9.

1 the extend the ‘CAP Policy Statement’ to the Public Utility Commission regulated water and
2 wastewater utilities.”²⁵ While, to date, this Joint Settlement obligation has not been effectuated, I
3 do not believe that it should stand as an impediment to making critical improvements to PWSA’s
4 low income programs, given the prevailing public policy related to the affordability of water and
5 wastewater rates, together with the substantial evidence presented earlier in this proceeding that
6 current rates are unaffordable to low income households. As I explained in my direct testimony,
7 the general consensus is that – to be considered affordable – the combined cost for water and
8 wastewater service should not exceed 2.5-4% of household income.²⁶ Moreover, there is ample
9 evidence from the level of arrears and terminations faced by PWSA’s low income customers that
10 PWSA’s low income customers already struggle to afford basic water and wastewater services.²⁷
11 Contrary to Ms. Quigley’s assertion, PWSA’s low income programs should and must be tasked
12 with making rates of service affordable for low income customers. Ms. Quigley’s assessment of
13 costs to other ratepayers and PWSA from these critical improvements fails to account for any of
14 the overarching financial benefits of providing robust low income assistance programs, including
15 the reduction of uncollectible expenses, collections expenses, and terminations.

16 I also refute Ms. Quigley’s assertion that PWSA’s changes to its low income assistance
17 programs have reasonably been informed by several sources, including the Household

²⁵ Pa. PUC v. PWSA, Order, Docket Nos. R-2020-3017951; R-2020-3017970; P-2020-3019019 (Order entered December 3, 2020); Joint Petition for Settlement at 5.c.

²⁶ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 16: 6-8. See, e.g., US Water Alliance, The Invisible Crisis: Water Affordability in the United States, at 33 (May 2016), available at: <http://uswateralliance.org/sites/uswateralliance.org/files/Invisible%20Crisis%20-%20Water%20Affordability%20in%20the%20US.pdf>; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., Water/Color: A Study of Race & The Water Affordability Crisis in America’s Cities (2019), available at: https://www.naacpldf.org/wp-content/uploads/Water_Report_FULL_5_31_19_FINAL_OPT.pdf; Roger Colton, The Affordability of Water and Wastewater Service in Twelve US Cities, The Guardian (May 2020), available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/jun/23/full-report-read-in-depth-water-poverty-investigation>.

²⁷ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 18-19.

1 Affordability Analysis. In PWSA’s last rate case proceeding, expert witness for Pittsburgh United,
2 Olivia Wein, extensively analyzed the limitations of the Household Affordability Analysis.²⁸ Ms.
3 Wein concluded as follows:

4 PWSA’s analysis ultimately provides limited insight into low income consumers in
5 PWSA’s service territory. As the Analysis itself points out, it is not meant to be a true
6 representation of all the financial challenges faced by PWSA customers, but rather an
7 overview of some affordability challenges faced by median and lowest quintile income
8 households.²⁹

9
10 Given the limitations inherent in the Household Affordability Analysis, and for the reasons
11 explained more thoroughly in Ms. Wein’s testimony in the last PWSA rate proceeding, I do not
12 believe that the Household Affordability Analysis provides a sound foundation on which to base
13 decisions for whether and how to improve and better PWSA’s low income assistance programs
14 to ensure that PWSA’s most vulnerable households will retain the economic ability to connect
15 and maintain running water and sanitation services to their homes.

16 **VI. PILOT ARREARAGE FORGIVENESS PROGRAM**

17 **Q: Please summarize Ms. Quigley’s rebuttal testimony regarding the Pilot Arrearage**
18 **Forgiveness Program (PAFP) to which you wish to respond.**

19 A: In her rebuttal testimony, Ms. Quigley disagrees with several recommendations set forth
20 in my direct testimony and the direct testimony of OCA expert witness, Roger Colton, regarding
21 PWSA’s PAFP. First, Ms. Quigley disagrees with Mr. Colton and my recommendation that newly

²⁸ Pa. PUC v. PWSA, Pittsburgh United Statement 1, Direct Testimony of Olivia Wein on Behalf of Pittsburgh United, Docket Nos. R-2020-3017951; R-2020-3017970; P-2020-3019019, at 19-28 (Direct Testimony dated July 21, 2020).

²⁹ Id. Pa. PUC v. PWSA, Pittsburgh United Statement 1-R, Rebuttal Testimony of Olivia Wein on Behalf of Pittsburgh United, Docket Nos. R-2020-3017951; R-2020-3017970; P-2020-3019019, at 19-28 (Direct Testimony dated August 18, 2020). I incorporate the direct and rebuttal testimony of Ms. Wein herein by reference pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 1.33.

1 enrolled BDP participants are automatically enrolled in the PAFP.³⁰ Ms. Quigley argues that there
2 are program rules – such as payment requirements – that customers must understand in order to
3 receive credits through the PAFP.³¹

4 Next, Ms. Quigley objects to the recommendations set forth in Mr. Colton and my direct
5 testimony to restructure the PAFP to provide full arrearage forgiveness of arrears accrued prior
6 to entry into the PAFP in three years.³² Ms. Quigley objects that (1) PWSA’s current Cogsdale
7 system cannot technically accommodate changes to the PAFP; (2) PWSA’s current PAFP
8 structure – which requires participants to enter into payment arrangements in order to receive
9 credits – incentivizes participants to pay on payment arrangements; and (3) restructuring the
10 PAFP will come at increased costs for program design and development.³³

11 Ms. Quigley further disagrees with Mr. Colton’s recommendation that PAFP credits
12 should be granted on a monthly basis for each complete payment that was successfully made
13 while enrolled in the PAFP – regardless of the timeliness of payments.³⁴ In his direct testimony,
14 Mr. Colton explains that this approach is consistent with prior Commission decisions regarding
15 energy utility arrearage forgiveness.³⁵ Ms. Quigley characterizes this approach as “unreasonable”
16 and supports the PAFP’s current approach whereby two missed payments are permitted before a
17 customer is removed for the PAFP, and a customer may reenroll upon paying past due
18 amounts.³⁶

³⁰ PWSA St. 6-R at 86: 29-36.

³¹ Id. at 86: 29-36.

³² Id. at 87: 1-21.

³³ Id. at 87: 1 – 88: 4.

³⁴ PWSA St. 6-R at 88: 5-13.

³⁵ OCA St. 4 at 15: 22-23.

³⁶ PWSA St. 6-R at 88: 5-13.

1 Ms. Quigley also objects to Mr. Colton’s recommendation that arrearage forgiveness
2 credits should be portable between service addresses within PWSA’s service territory.³⁷ Ms.
3 Quigley indicates that, PWSA “always keeps the debt at the property” for lien purposes and thus
4 cannot offer portable credits.³⁸

5 **Q: What is your response to Ms. Quigley’s argument that BDP participants should not**
6 **automatically be enrolled in the PAFP?**

7 A: As I detail in my direct testimony, the PAFP is highly undersubscribed and fails to
8 meaningfully address arrears accrued by PWSA’s low income customers.³⁹ I recommend in my
9 direct testimony that customers who enroll in the BDP with existing arrearages should
10 automatically be enrolled in and receive the benefits of the PAFP.⁴⁰ As discussed, customers
11 should not be required to apply for arrearage forgiveness as a separate process, but rather should
12 be provided the benefit as an integrated component of the BDP.⁴¹ I also recommend in my direct
13 testimony that, on entry into the BDP (and thus the PAFP), BDP participants’ pre-program arrears
14 should be frozen, and BDP participants should no longer be required to make payments on these
15 arrears, and these arrears should no longer incur late fees or other associated charges.⁴²

16 At the time of entry into the BDP, new enrollees will necessarily be provided information
17 related to the BDP’s terms and conditions, and their obligations while enrolled in the BDP. I do
18 not find it particularly burdensome to simultaneously provide BDP enrollees with information
19 about the PAFP. Given the disproportionately high cost PWSA pays for administration of its BDP,

³⁷ Id. at 88: 14-19.

³⁸ Id.

³⁹ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 38-40.

⁴⁰ Id. at 40: 17-18.

⁴¹ Id. at 41: 2-5.

⁴² Id. at 41: 8-15.

1 I do not believe the provision of additional education and information about the PAFP would
2 require additional administrative costs. As I discuss in my direct testimony, providing customers
3 with arrearage management is commonly offered as a component of other regulated utility's bill
4 affordability programs, rather than a stand-alone program.⁴³ Providing arrearage management
5 along with the discount offered under the BDP would not detract from customer's knowledge of
6 the terms and conditions of the BDP, but rather provide customers with a fuller picture of the
7 affordability of their bills while enrolled in the BDP and PAFP.

8 **Q: What is your response to Ms. Quigley's argument that structural changes to the PAFP**
9 **are technologically infeasible?**

10 A: I am cognizant of the limitations of PWSA's current Cogsdale system. However, as Ms.
11 Quigley points out, PWSA has begun its Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system upgrades,
12 which will convert the Cogsdale system to SAP.⁴⁴ Given that Ms. Quigley has not adequately
13 explained what arrearage forgiveness structures are specifically disallowed by PWSA's current
14 system, or why, I stand by my recommendation that PWSA take immediate steps to implement the
15 arrearage forgiveness structure detailed in my direct testimony.⁴⁵

16 In the event that the Commission and ALJ in this matter find that PWSA is not able to
17 implement my recommended structural changes to the PAFP, I recommend – in the alternative –
18 that PWSA increase the level of monthly forgiveness to \$30 monthly upon the effective date of
19 rates in this proceeding. Increasing the forgiveness level to \$30 will better help to address accrued
20 arrears within a reasonable period of time. Within 12 months of transitioning to the SAP, PWSA
21 should be required to implement the PAFP structure I recommended in direct testimony, which

⁴³ Id. at 41: 5-7.

⁴⁴ PWSA St. 6-R at 78: 21-79: 2.

⁴⁵ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 41: 16-22.

1 will allow for more targeted and equitable forgiveness to be earned by BDP participants over a
2 reasonable period of time..

3 **Q: What is your response to Ms. Quigley’s argument that structural changes to the PAFP**
4 **disincentivizes participants to pay on payment arrangements?**

5 A: I disagree with the premise of Ms. Quigley’s argument that PAFP participants should be
6 required to enter a payment arrangement in order to incentivize payment. As I discuss in my direct
7 testimony, BDP customers should not be required to enter into payment arrangements as a
8 condition of enrolling in the PAFP.⁴⁶ Requiring PAFP participants to enter into payment
9 arrangements only compounds unaffordability - often erasing the improvements in affordability
10 gained through the program.⁴⁷ Customers in PWSA’s PAFP must currently pay both on the BDP
11 rate – which is already unaffordable for many low income families – in addition to the payment
12 arrangement amount.⁴⁸ Requiring customers to enter into a payment arrangement as a condition of
13 entering into the PAFP further increases customers’ monthly bills, undermining affordability
14 gained with the program. On the other hand, adoption of my recommendations to the PAFP would
15 help improve both bill coverage and bill affordability. Allowing for earned forgiveness with each
16 on-time payment on the BDP – without requiring an additional payment arrangement – properly
17 incentivizes payment without undermining affordability achieved through the program, helps
18 stabilize uncollectible expenses, and provides an appropriate alternative to collections for low
19 income households that are unable to keep up with their bill plus a payment arrangement.

20 **Q: What is your response to Ms. Quigley’s argument that structural changes to the PAFP**
21 **are infeasible because they will come at increased program costs?**

⁴⁶ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 41: 8-15.

⁴⁷ Id. at 40: 4-14.

⁴⁸ Id.

1 A: Ms. Quigley’s analysis fails to account for the increased cost to low income customers,
2 other ratepayers, and PWSA as a result of unmanageable arrearage levels. As I discussed in my
3 direct testimony, BDP customers’ arrears, on average, amount to approximately \$868.50 per BDP
4 customer.⁴⁹ If low income customers are not given a reasonable and meaningful way to catch up
5 on past due balances, the collections benefits of low income programs – including reduced
6 collection expended and uncollectible expenses – will not be realized. Instead, low income
7 customers will face unmanageable arrearage levels and terminations as a result of unaffordable
8 monthly bills.

9 **Q: Do you support Mr. Colton’s recommendation that PAFP credits should be granted**
10 **for complete payments while enrolled in the PAFP – regardless of timing?**

11 A: Yes. I agree with Mr. Colton that arrearage forgiveness credits should be granted on a
12 monthly basis for each complete payment that is successfully made while enrolled in the PAFP.
13 These credits should be granted regardless of the “timeliness” to complete payment. As noted by
14 Mr. Colton this approach is consistent with prior Commission directives related to energy utilities’
15 arrearage forgiveness.⁵⁰

16 **Q: Do you support Mr. Colton’s recommendation that PAFP credits should be portable**
17 **between addresses within PWSA’s service territory?**

18 A: Yes. Like Mr. Colton, I do not believe that PWSA’s low income customers who have
19 worked towards arrearage forgiveness while enrolled in the PAFP should be punished for
20 moving.⁵¹ These customers should not be required to reapply for the PAFP for simply moving to
21 another residence within the same service territory and should not face removal from the PAFP as

⁴⁹ Id. at 39: 14-15, citing OCA I-12a, Attachment; OCA I-13, Attachment.

⁵⁰ OCA St. 4 at 16: 1-4.

⁵¹ Id. at 16: 5-10.

1 a result of their decision to move.⁵² This is particularly problematic for low income customers
2 who are forced to move as a result of factors out of their control, including but not limited to, when
3 they cannot afford their monthly rents, when they face job losses and/or wage reductions, or for
4 customers who are victims of domestic violence who are required to change residences in order to
5 escape from unsafe households. While Ms. Quigley objects that PWSA's approach is to keep debt
6 with properties to pursue liens, I am advised by counsel for Pittsburgh United that there is an open
7 question as to whether PWSA's policies related to debt assignment are compliant with
8 Pennsylvania statute and Commission regulations and policies. Counsel for Pittsburgh United
9 advises me that Pittsburgh United reserves the right to address these issues in the context of
10 PWSA's ongoing compliance proceeding. Overall, I recommend that arrearage forgiveness credits
11 should be portable between service addresses, consistent with the recommendations of Mr. Colton,
12 so long as a service address for a program participant is within PWSA's service territory.

13 **VII. BILL DISCOUNT PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS**

14 **Q: Please summarize Ms. Quigley's rebuttal testimony regarding proposed**
15 **improvements to the structure of the BDP to which you wish to respond.**

16 A: In my direct testimony, I recommend that PWSA transition the BDP to a percentage of
17 income program (PIP), which targets affordability based on an individual's income level. I
18 recommend that PWSA target affordability for a PIP-structured BDP at 2.5, 3, and 4% of
19 household income for those at 0-50%, 51-100% FPL, and 101-150% FPL, respectively, for dual
20 water and wastewater customers.⁵³ In her rebuttal testimony, Ms. Quigley disagrees with my

⁵² Id.

⁵³ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 37: 17 – 38: 2.

1 recommendation that PWSA implement a PIP.⁵⁴ Ms. Quigley argues that (1) it is inappropriate to
2 disconnect required payment amounts with usage and will hamper conservation efforts; (2) there
3 is no specific Commission guidance related to affordability of water/wastewater rates; (3)
4 determining how much customers pay based on income level is complex and under debate; and
5 (4) while the Philadelphia Water Department has a similar PIP structure in place, enrollment levels
6 are not significant and “other problems with the program design exist.”⁵⁵

7 **Q: How do you respond to Ms. Quigley’s rebuttal testimony opposing the**
8 **implementation of a PIP structure for BDP participants?**

9 A: I do not believe that implementing a PIP structure for the BDP will disconnect BDP
10 customers from payment amounts or hinder conservation efforts. Many low income customers
11 experience high usage as a result of larger family sizes or inability to make repairs or improvements
12 to their homes, resulting in leaky pipes and fixtures – and thus necessarily have higher usage as a
13 result of their circumstances.⁵⁶ These customers should not be punished with unaffordable monthly
14 bill amounts. The current structure of the BDP does not provide an equitable distribution of
15 assistance for PWSA’s low income customers, and moreover fails achieve the vital goals of bill
16 discount of customer assistance programs, including but not limited to, improved payment
17 behavior, reduced terminations for nonpayment, and better long-term affordability.⁵⁷ Many
18 regulated utilities that successfully operate a PIP structure for their low income assistance
19 programs have developed ways to encourage conservation while customers are enrolled in a bill

⁵⁴ PWSA St. 6-R at 83.

⁵⁵ Id. at 83-84.

⁵⁶ Pittsburgh United St. 1 at 36: 13-15.

⁵⁷ Id. at 36-37.

1 discount program. This includes referral to conservation programs to ensure that low income
2 customers experiencing high usage are provided a reasonable means to address conservation issues
3 within their households.

4 As I have already discussed, Ms. Quigley's argument that additional improvements to the
5 BDP are inappropriate because the Commission has not provided overall standards for the
6 affordability of water/wastewater services ignores the growing consensus amongst experts of
7 levels of affordability for water and wastewater customers.

8 Finally, while I do not contest that the Philadelphia Water Department's PIP-style discount
9 program may benefit from additional measures to increase program enrollment, the fact remains
10 that many other regulated utilities, as well as the Philadelphia Water Department, have taken steps
11 to improve the level of bill discount offered to low income customers to deliver a targeted,
12 affordable bill.

13 **Q: Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?**

14 **A:** Yes.

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission :
:
v. : **Docket Nos.** **R-2021-3024773**
: **R-2021-3024774**
: **R-2021-3024779**
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority :

VERIFICATION

I, Harry Geller, Esq., verify that:

- Pittsburgh United Statement No. 1, the prepared Direct Testimony of Harry Geller, consisting of 50 pages of testimony, Exhibit 1-a, 1-b, and 1-c, and Appendices A and B.
- Pittsburgh United Statement No. 1-R, the prepared Rebuttal Testimony of Harry Geller, consisting of 7 pages of testimony.
- Pittsburgh United Statement No. 1-SR, the prepared Surrebutal Testimony of Harry Geller, consisting of 19 pages of testimony.

were prepared by me or under my direct supervision, and are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. I understand that the statements made herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 (relating to unsworn falsification to authorities).



Harry Geller, Esq.
118 Locust Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Date: August 11, 2021

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024773
	:	C-2021-3025473
v.	:	C-2021-3025516
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Water	:	

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024774
	:	C-2021-3025471
v.	:	C-2021-3025517
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Wastewater:	:	

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024779
	:	C-2021-3025474
v.	:	C-2021-3025521
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Stormwater:	:	

POST-HEARING ORDER

Admitting Evidence Introduced
at Evidentiary Hearing

On April 13, 2021, Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (“PWSA”) filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission: (1) a water base rate case at Docket No. R-2021-3024773; (2) a wastewater base rate case at Docket No. R-2021-3024774; (3) a stormwater base rate case at Docket No. R-2021-3024779, (4) a Petition for Waiver of Statutory Definition of Fully Projected Future Test Year; and (5) a Petition for Consolidation of Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Rate Proceedings and For Authorization to Use Combined Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Revenue Requirements.

Pursuant to the Rate Filing, PWSA is asking the Commission for approval to increase its combined water, wastewater and stormwater rates by \$32.2 million, to be phased-in in 2022 and 2023. In particular, PWSA's Supplement No. 7 to Tariff Water – Pa. P.U.C. No. 1 proposes a rate increase that would increase PWSA's total annual operating revenues for water service by approximately \$12.6 million, or 10%, through rates effective January 12, 2022, and by approximately \$12.9 million, or 9.3%, through rates effective January 12, 2023. Next, PWSA's Supplement No. 6 Tariff Wastewater - Pa. P.U.C. No. 1 proposes a rate decrease that will reduce PWSA's total annual operating revenues for wastewater service by approximately \$7.8 million, or 10.6%, through rates effective January 12, 2022, and by approximately \$7.5 million, or 11.4%, through rates effective January 12, 2023. Finally, PWSA filed Tariff Storm Water - Pa. P.U.C. No. 1 proposing a rate increase that will raise PWSA's total annual operating revenues for stormwater service by approximately \$17.8 million through rates effective January 12, 2022, and by approximately \$5.9 million, through rates effective January 12, 2023.

On August 13, 2021, the presiding officer conducted the evidentiary hearing. During the evidentiary hearing, various parties identified and moved to admit evidence in the form of written statements and exhibits. All parties present waived the right to cross-examine the evidence. Accordingly, the evidence was marked and admitted into the hearing record by order of the presiding officer, without objection from any party.

The presiding officer directed the parties submitting evidence to electronically file the evidence with the Commission within two weeks of the date of this Post-Hearing Order along with a cover letter which notes the admission at the evidentiary hearing on August 13, 2021, and the issuance of the Post-Hearing Order.

AND NOW, having received evidence into the hearing record from PWSA, the statutory advocates and other active parties on August 13, 2021, without an objection; and

FURTHER, because the admitted evidence must be included in the hearing record for this proceeding; and

FURTHER, because no further hearing is to be scheduled in this proceeding.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That all parties which sponsored and moved for the admission of the evidence at the evidentiary hearing conducted on August 13, 2021, shall reference this Post-Hearing Order when filing electronically (through eFile) with the Commission all of the items listed in Appendix A, attached, within 14 days of the date of this Order.

2. That any party wishing to place evidence into the hearing record, when the evidence is marked as “Confidential”, “Highly Confidential” or “Proprietary”, shall ensure the evidence is clearly marked as “Confidential”, “Highly Confidential” or “Proprietary” and shall reference this Post-Hearing Order when electronically mailing the evidence directly to the Commission’s Secretary, Rosemary Chiavetta, for inclusion in the Commission’s hearing record in a protected file.

Date: August 17, 2021

/s/
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge

Appendix A

Pittsburgh Water and Sewer

Direct Testimony (dated 4/13/21)

- PWSA St. No. 1 - Direct Testimony of William J. Pickering – Exhibits WJP-1, WJP-2
- PWSA St. No. 2 – Direct Testimony of Edward Barca – Exhibits EB-1 to EB-10
- PWSA St. No. 3 – Direct Testimony of Tom Huestis – Appendix A, TH-1 to TH-5
- PWSA St. No. 4 – Direct Testimony of Harold Smith – Exhibits HJS-1 to HJS-4, HJS-1W to HJS-19W, HJS-1WW to HJS-18WW, HJS-1SW to HJS-9SW
- PWSA St. No. 5 – Direct Testimony of Barry King – Exhibits BK-1, BK-2
- PWSA St. No. 6 – Direct Testimony of Julie Quigley – Exhibits JAQ-1 to JAQ-6
- PWSA St. No. 7 – Direct Testimony of Tony Igwe – Appendix A, Exhibits TI-1 to TI-5
- PWSA St. No. 8 – Direct Testimony of Keith Readling – Appendix A, Exhibit KR-1

Supplemental Direct Testimony (dated 6/14/21)

- PWSA St. No. 2-SD – Supplemental Direct Testimony of Edward Barca
- PWSA St. No. 5-SD – Supplemental Direct Testimony of Barry King
- PWSA St. No. 7-SD – Supplemental Direct Testimony of Tony Igwe - Exhibit TI-6
- PWSA St. No. 8-SD – Supplemental Direct Testimony of Keith Readling

Rebuttal Testimony (dated 7/29/21 and 7/30/21)

- PWSA St. No. 1-R (rev. 7/30/21)-Rebuttal Testimony of William J. Pickering – Exhibit WJP-3
- PWSA St. No. 2-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Edward Barca – Exhibits EB-11 to EB-16
- PWSA St. No. 3-R (rev. 8/4/21) - Rebuttal Testimony of Thomas F. Huestis - Exhibits TH-6, TH-7
- PWSA St. No. 4-R - Rebuttal Testimony of Harold Smith – Exhibit HJS-1-R to HJS-3-R, HJS-1W-R to HJS-19W-R, HJS-1WW-R to HJS-18WW-R, HJS-1SW-R to HJS-9SW-R
- PWSA St. No. 5-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Barry King – Exhibits BK-3
- PWSA St. No. 6-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Julie Quigley – Exhibits JAQ-7 to JAQ-11
- PWSA St. No. 7-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Tony Igwe – Exhibit TI-7
- PWSA St. No. 8-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Keith Readling

Surrebuttal Testimony (dated 8/6/21)

- PWSA St. No. 2-SR - Surrebuttal Testimony of Edward Barca

Rejoinder Testimony (dated 8/10/21)

- PWSA St. No. 2-RJ – Rejoinder Testimony of Edward Barca – Exhibits EB-17 to EB-21
- PWSA St. No. 3-RJ - Rejoinder Testimony of Thomas F. Huestis
- PWSA St. No. 5-RJ - Rejoinder Testimony of Barry King – Exhibits BK-4 to BK-6

- PWSA St. No. 6-RJ – Rejoinder Testimony of Julie A. Quigley
- PWSA St. No. 8-RJ – Rejoinder Testimony of Keith Readling Non (**PWSA**)

Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (I&E)

Direct Testimony

- I&E St. No. 1 – Direct Testimony of Anthony Spadaccio – I&E Exhibit No. 1
- I&E St. No. 2 – Direct Testimony of D.C. Patel - I&E Exhibit No. 2
- I&E St. No. 3 – Direct Testimony of Ethan H. Cline – I&E Exhibit No. 3
- I&E St. No. 4 – Direct Testimony of Israel E. Gray – I&E Exhibit No. 4

Rebuttal Testimony

- I&E St. No. 2-R – Rebuttal Testimony of D.C. Patel

Surrebuttal Testimony

- I&E St. 1-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Anthony Spadaccio - I&E Exhibit No. 1-SR
- I&E St. No. 2-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of D.C. Patel
- I&E St. No. 3-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Ethan H. Cline – I&E Exhibit No. 3-SR
- I&E St. No. 4-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Israel E. Gray – I&E Exhibit No. 4-SR
- Verification Statement of Anthony Spadaccio
- Verification Statement of D.C. Patel
- Verification Statement of Ethan H. Cline
- Verification Statement of Israel E. Gray

Office of Consumer Advocate

Direct Testimony

- OCA St. No. 1 – Direct Testimony of Dante Mugrace - Schedules DM-1 to DM-20
- OCA St. No. 2 - Direct Testimony of David S. Habr - Exhibits DSH-1 through DSH-5
- OCA St. No.3 – Direct Testimony of Scott J. Rubin – Appendix A and Schedules SJR-1 to SJR-7
- OCA St. No. 4 – Direct Testimony of Roger D. Colton – Appendix A
- OCA St. No. 5 (rev. 7/23/21) – Direct Testimony of Barbara R. Alexander – Exhibits BA-1 through BA-3
- OCA St. No. 6 – Direct Testimony of Terry L. Fought – Appendix A and Exhibits TLF-1 through TLF-8
- OCA St. No. 7 – Direct Testimony of Morgan N. DeAngelo – Appendix A

Rebuttal Testimony

- OCA St. No. 3R – Rebuttal Testimony of Scott J. Rubin – Schedules SJR-8 through SJR-10

- OCA St. No. 4R – Rebuttal Testimony of Roger D. Colton

Surrebuttal Testimony

- OCA St. No. 1SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Dante Mugrace
- OCA St. No. 2SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of David S. Habr
- OCA St. No. 3SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Scott J. Rubin
- OCA St. No. 4SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Roger D. Colton
- OCA St. No. 5SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Barbara R. Alexander
- OCA St. No. 6SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Fought
- OCA St. No. 7SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Morgan N. DeAngelo

Office of Small Business Advocate

Direct Testimony

- OSBA St. No. 1 – Direct Testimony of Brian Kalcic – Exhibit BK-1 (Schedules BK-1W through BK-4W; Schedules BK-1WW through BK-4WW; Schedules BK-1SW through BK-4SW), Referenced Interrogatories, an appendix and Mr. Kalcic’s signed Verification

Rebuttal Testimony

- OSBA St. No. 1-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Brian Kalcic – Exhibit BK-1R (Schedule BK-2SW Corrected; Schedule BK-4SW Corrected; Schedule BK-4WW Corrected), Referenced Interrogatories, and Mr. Kalcic’s signed Verification

Surrebuttal Testimony

- OSBA St. No. 1-S – Surrebuttal Testimony of Brian Kalcic – Exhibit BK-1S (Schedule BK-1W-S; Schedule BK-2W-S; Schedule BK-4W-S) and Mr. Kalcic’s signed Verification

R-2021-3024773, et al. - PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION v. THE PITTSBURGH
WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY

Revised: August 9, 2021

DEANNE M. O'DELL ESQUIRE
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &
MELLOTT, LLC
213 MARKET STREET, 8th FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.255.3744
dodell@eckertseamans.com
Accepts eService
(Representing PWSA)

LAUREN M BURGE ESQUIRE
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &
MELLOTT, LLC
600 GRANT STREET 44TH FLOOR
PITTSBURGH PA 15219
412.566.2146
lburge@eckertseamans.com
Accepts eService
(Representing PWSA)

GINA MILLER ESQUIRE
PA PUC BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT
400 NORTH STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17120
717.783.8754
ginmiller@pa.gov
Accepts eService

ERIN L. GANNON ESQUIRE
LAUREN E. GUERRA ESQUIRE
CHRISTINE M. HOOVER ESQUIRE
OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE
555 WALNUT STREET, 5th FLOOR
FORUM PLACE
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.783.5048
egannon@paoca.org
lguerra@paoca.org
choover@paoca.org
Accepts eService

RIA PEREIRA ESQUIRE
ELIZABETH R. MARX ESQUIRE
JOHN SWEET ESQUIRE
LAUREN BERMAN ESQUIRE*
PA UTILITY LAW PROJECT
118 LOCUST STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.710.3839
rpereirapulp@palegalaid.net
emarx@pautilitylawproject.org
jsweetpulp@palegalaid.org
pulp@palegalaid.net
Accepts eService
(*Representing Pittsburgh United*)

ERIN FURE ESQUIRE*
TERESA REED WAGNER*
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCATE
FORUM PLACE
555 WALNUT STREET 1ST FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.783.2525
efure@pa.gov
tereswagne@pa.gov

WHITNEY E. SNYDER ESQUIRE
THOMAS J. SNISCAK ESQUIRE
KEVIN J. MCKEON ESQUIRE
HAWKE, MCKEON AND SNISCAK, LLP
100 N 10TH STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.236.1300
wesnyder@hmslegal.com
tjsniscak@hmslegal.com
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com
Accepts eService
(*Counsel for the City of Pittsburgh*)

YVONNE HILTON ESQUIRE*
CITY OF PITTSBURGH
313 CITY-COUNTY BUILDING
414 GRANT STREET
PITTSBURGH PA 15219
412.255.2009
yvonne.hilton@pittsburghpa.gov

JOHN F. DOHERTY ESQUIRE
LAWRENCE H. BAUMILLER ESQUIRE
CITY OF PITTSBURGH DEPARTMENT OF LAW
414 GRANT STREET
313 CITY COUNTY BUILDING
PITTSBURGH PA 15220
412.255.2016
john.doherty@pittsburghpa.gov
lawrence.baumiller@pittsburghpa.gov
Accepts eService

PETER DEMARCO ESQUIRE*
JARED J. THOMPSON ESQUIRE*
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
1152 15TH STREET NORTHWEST, SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20005
202.513.2267
pdemarco@nrdc.org
jared.thompson@nrdc.org

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024773
	:	C-2021-3025473
v.	:	C-2021-3025516
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Water	:	

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024774
	:	C-2021-3025471
v.	:	C-2021-3025517
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Wastewater:	:	

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024779
	:	C-2021-3025474
v.	:	C-2021-3025521
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Stormwater:	:	

ERRATA

A review of the document issued in the above-captioned proceedings on August 17, 2021, revealed an error in the document. Specifically, Appendix A failed to include the evidence moved into the record at the August 13, 2021, hearing by Pittsburgh United and admitted into the record by the presiding officer. This error has been corrected with a new heading added to Appendix A listing the written, pre-served testimony submitted by Pittsburgh United along with accompanying exhibits and appendices, witness verifications, as well as the Joint Stipulation of Pittsburgh United and the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority and United/PWSA Joint Stipulation Appendix A

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024773
	:	C-2021-3025473
v.	:	C-2021-3025516
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Water	:	

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024774
	:	C-2021-3025471
v.	:	C-2021-3025517
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Wastewater:	:	

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, <i>et al</i>	:	R-2021-3024779
	:	C-2021-3025474
v.	:	C-2021-3025521
	:	
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority - Stormwater:	:	

POST-HEARING ORDER

Admitting Evidence Introduced
at Evidentiary Hearing

On April 13, 2021, Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority (“PWSA”) filed with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission: (1) a water base rate case at Docket No. R-2021-3024773; (2) a wastewater base rate case at Docket No. R-2021-3024774; (3) a stormwater base rate case at Docket No. R-2021-3024779, (4) a Petition for Waiver of Statutory Definition of Fully Projected Future Test Year; and (5) a Petition for Consolidation of Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Rate Proceedings and For Authorization to Use Combined Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Revenue Requirements.

Pursuant to the Rate Filing, PWSA is asking the Commission for approval to increase its combined water, wastewater and stormwater rates by \$32.2 million, to be phased-in in 2022 and 2023. In particular, PWSA's Supplement No. 7 to Tariff Water – Pa. P.U.C. No. 1 proposes a rate increase that would increase PWSA's total annual operating revenues for water service by approximately \$12.6 million, or 10%, through rates effective January 12, 2022, and by approximately \$12.9 million, or 9.3%, through rates effective January 12, 2023. Next, PWSA's Supplement No. 6 Tariff Wastewater - Pa. P.U.C. No. 1 proposes a rate decrease that will reduce PWSA's total annual operating revenues for wastewater service by approximately \$7.8 million, or 10.6%, through rates effective January 12, 2022, and by approximately \$7.5 million, or 11.4%, through rates effective January 12, 2023. Finally, PWSA filed Tariff Storm Water - Pa. P.U.C. No. 1 proposing a rate increase that will raise PWSA's total annual operating revenues for stormwater service by approximately \$17.8 million through rates effective January 12, 2022, and by approximately \$5.9 million, through rates effective January 12, 2023.

On August 13, 2021, the presiding officer conducted the evidentiary hearing. During the evidentiary hearing, various parties identified and moved to admit evidence in the form of written statements and exhibits. All parties present waived the right to cross-examine the evidence. Accordingly, the evidence was marked and admitted into the hearing record by order of the presiding officer, without objection from any party.

The presiding officer directed the parties submitting evidence to electronically file the evidence with the Commission within two weeks of the date of this Post-Hearing Order along with a cover letter which notes the admission at the evidentiary hearing on August 13, 2021, and the issuance of the Post-Hearing Order.

AND NOW, having received evidence into the hearing record from PWSA, the statutory advocates and other active parties on August 13, 2021, without an objection; and

FURTHER, because the admitted evidence must be included in the hearing record for this proceeding; and

FURTHER, because no further hearing is to be scheduled in this proceeding.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That all parties which sponsored and moved for the admission of the evidence at the evidentiary hearing conducted on August 13, 2021, shall reference this Post-Hearing Order when filing electronically (through eFile) with the Commission all of the items listed in Appendix A, attached, within 14 days of the date of this Order.

2. That any party wishing to place evidence into the hearing record, when the evidence is marked as “Confidential”, “Highly Confidential” or “Proprietary”, shall ensure the evidence is clearly marked as “Confidential”, “Highly Confidential” or “Proprietary” and shall reference this Post-Hearing Order when electronically mailing the evidence directly to the Commission’s Secretary, Rosemary Chiavetta, for inclusion in the Commission’s hearing record in a protected file.

Date: August 18, 2021

/s/
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge

Appendix A

Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority

Direct Testimony (dated 4/13/21)

- PWSA St. No. 1 - Direct Testimony of William J. Pickering – Exhibits WJP-1, WJP-2
- PWSA St. No. 2 – Direct Testimony of Edward Barca – Exhibits EB-1 to EB-10
- PWSA St. No. 3 – Direct Testimony of Tom Huestis – Appendix A, TH-1 to TH-5
- PWSA St. No. 4 – Direct Testimony of Harold Smith – Exhibits HJS-1 to HJS-4, HJS-1W to HJS-19W, HJS-1WW to HJS-18WW, HJS-1SW to HJS-9SW
- PWSA St. No. 5 – Direct Testimony of Barry King – Exhibits BK-1, BK-2
- PWSA St. No. 6 – Direct Testimony of Julie Quigley – Exhibits JAQ-1 to JAQ-6
- PWSA St. No. 7 – Direct Testimony of Tony Igwe – Appendix A, Exhibits TI-1 to TI-5
- PWSA St. No. 8 – Direct Testimony of Keith Readling – Appendix A, Exhibit KR-1

Supplemental Direct Testimony (dated 6/14/21)

- PWSA St. No. 2-SD – Supplemental Direct Testimony of Edward Barca
- PWSA St. No. 5-SD – Supplemental Direct Testimony of Barry King
- PWSA St. No. 7-SD – Supplemental Direct Testimony of Tony Igwe - Exhibit TI-6
- PWSA St. No. 8-SD – Supplemental Direct Testimony of Keith Readling

Rebuttal Testimony (dated 7/29/21 and 7/30/21)

- PWSA St. No. 1-R (rev. 7/30/21)-Rebuttal Testimony of William J. Pickering – Exhibit WJP-3
- PWSA St. No. 2-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Edward Barca – Exhibits EB-11 to EB-16
- PWSA St. No. 3-R (rev. 8/4/21) - Rebuttal Testimony of Thomas F. Huestis - Exhibits TH-6, TH-7
- PWSA St. No. 4-R - Rebuttal Testimony of Harold Smith – Exhibit HJS-1-R to HJS-3-R, HJS-1W-R to HJS-19W-R, HJS-1WW-R to HJS-18WW-R, HJS-1SW-R to HJS-9SW-R
- PWSA St. No. 5-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Barry King – Exhibits BK-3
- PWSA St. No. 6-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Julie Quigley – Exhibits JAQ-7 to JAQ-11
- PWSA St. No. 7-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Tony Igwe – Exhibit TI-7
- PWSA St. No. 8-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Keith Readling

Surrebuttal Testimony (dated 8/6/21)

- PWSA St. No. 2-SR - Surrebuttal Testimony of Edward Barca

Rejoinder Testimony (dated 8/10/21)

- PWSA St. No. 2-RJ – Rejoinder Testimony of Edward Barca – Exhibits EB-17 to EB-21
- PWSA St. No. 3-RJ - Rejoinder Testimony of Thomas F. Huestis
- PWSA St. No. 5-RJ - Rejoinder Testimony of Barry King – Exhibits BK-4 to BK-6

- PWSA St. No. 6-RJ – Rejoinder Testimony of Julie A. Quigley
- PWSA St. No. 8-RJ – Rejoinder Testimony of Keith Readling Non (**PWSA**)

Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (I&E)

Direct Testimony

- I&E St. No. 1 – Direct Testimony of Anthony Spadaccio – I&E Exhibit No. 1
- I&E St. No. 2 – Direct Testimony of D.C. Patel - I&E Exhibit No. 2
- I&E St. No. 3 – Direct Testimony of Ethan H. Cline – I&E Exhibit No. 3
- I&E St. No. 4 – Direct Testimony of Israel E. Gray – I&E Exhibit No. 4

Rebuttal Testimony

- I&E St. No. 2-R – Rebuttal Testimony of D.C. Patel

Surrebuttal Testimony

- I&E St. 1-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Anthony Spadaccio - I&E Exhibit No. 1-SR
- I&E St. No. 2-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of D.C. Patel
- I&E St. No. 3-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Ethan H. Cline – I&E Exhibit No. 3-SR
- I&E St. No. 4-SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Israel E. Gray – I&E Exhibit No. 4-SR
- Verification Statement of Anthony Spadaccio
- Verification Statement of D.C. Patel
- Verification Statement of Ethan H. Cline
- Verification Statement of Israel E. Gray

Office of Consumer Advocate

Direct Testimony

- OCA St. No. 1 – Direct Testimony of Dante Mugrace - Schedules DM-1 to DM-20
- OCA St. No. 2 - Direct Testimony of David S. Habr - Exhibits DSH-1 through DSH-5
- OCA St. No.3 – Direct Testimony of Scott J. Rubin – Appendix A and Schedules SJR-1 to SJR-7
- OCA St. No. 4 – Direct Testimony of Roger D. Colton – Appendix A
- OCA St. No. 5 (rev. 7/23/21) – Direct Testimony of Barbara R. Alexander – Exhibits BA-1 through BA-3
- OCA St. No. 6 – Direct Testimony of Terry L. Fought – Appendix A and Exhibits TLF-1 through TLF-8
- OCA St. No. 7 – Direct Testimony of Morgan N. DeAngelo – Appendix A

Rebuttal Testimony

- OCA St. No. 3R – Rebuttal Testimony of Scott J. Rubin – Schedules SJR-8 through SJR-10

- OCA St. No. 4R – Rebuttal Testimony of Roger D. Colton

Surrebuttal Testimony

- OCA St. No. 1SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Dante Mugrace
- OCA St. No. 2SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of David S. Habr
- OCA St. No. 3SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Scott J. Rubin
- OCA St. No. 4SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Roger D. Colton
- OCA St. No. 5SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Barbara R. Alexander
- OCA St. No. 6SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Terry L. Fought
- OCA St. No. 7SR – Surrebuttal Testimony of Morgan N. DeAngelo

Office of Small Business Advocate

Direct Testimony

- OSBA St. No. 1 – Direct Testimony of Brian Kalcic – Exhibit BK-1 (Schedules BK-1W through BK-4W; Schedules BK-1WW through BK-4WW; Schedules BK-1SW through BK-4SW), Referenced Interrogatories, an appendix and Mr. Kalcic’s signed Verification

Rebuttal Testimony

- OSBA St. No. 1-R – Rebuttal Testimony of Brian Kalcic – Exhibit BK-1R (Schedule BK-2SW Corrected; Schedule BK-4SW Corrected; Schedule BK-4WW Corrected), Referenced Interrogatories, and Mr. Kalcic’s signed Verification

Surrebuttal Testimony

- OSBA St. No. 1-S – Surrebuttal Testimony of Brian Kalcic – Exhibit BK-1S (Schedule BK-1W-S; Schedule BK-2W-S; Schedule BK-4W-S) and Mr. Kalcic’s signed Verification

Pittsburgh United

Direct Testimony

- Pittsburgh United St. No. 1 - Direct Testimony of Harry Geller – Pittsburgh United Exhibit 1 - Appendices A and B.
- Pittsburgh United St. No. 2 - Direct Testimony of Michele C. Adams – Appendices A and B.

Rebuttal Testimony

- Pittsburgh United St. No. 1-R - Rebuttal Testimony of Harry Geller

Surrebuttal Testimony

- Pittsburgh United St. No. 1-SR - Surrebuttal Testimony of Harry Geller
- Pittsburgh United St. No. 2-SR - Surrebuttal Testimony of Michele C. Adams

- Verification of Pittsburgh United expert witness, Harry Geller
- Verification of Pittsburgh United expert witness, Michele C. Adams
- Joint Stipulation of Pittsburgh United and the Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority and United/PWSA Joint Stipulation Appendix A

R-2021-3024773, et al. - PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION v. THE PITTSBURGH
WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY

Revised: August 9, 2021

DEANNE M. O'DELL ESQUIRE
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &
MELLOTT, LLC
213 MARKET STREET, 8th FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.255.3744
dodell@eckertseamans.com
Accepts eService
(Representing PWSA)

LAUREN M BURGE ESQUIRE
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &
MELLOTT, LLC
600 GRANT STREET 44TH FLOOR
PITTSBURGH PA 15219
412.566.2146
lburge@eckertseamans.com
Accepts eService
(Representing PWSA)

GINA MILLER ESQUIRE
PA PUC BUREAU OF
INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT
400 NORTH STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17120
717.783.8754
ginmiller@pa.gov
Accepts eService

ERIN L. GANNON ESQUIRE
LAUREN E. GUERRA ESQUIRE
CHRISTINE M. HOOVER ESQUIRE
OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE
555 WALNUT STREET, 5th FLOOR
FORUM PLACE
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.783.5048
egannon@paoca.org
lguerra@paoca.org
choover@paoca.org
Accepts eService

RIA PEREIRA ESQUIRE
ELIZABETH R. MARX ESQUIRE
JOHN SWEET ESQUIRE
LAUREN BERMAN ESQUIRE*
PA UTILITY LAW PROJECT
118 LOCUST STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.710.3839
rpereirapulp@palegalaid.net
emarx@pautilitylawproject.org
jsweetpulp@palegalaid.org
pulp@palegalaid.net
Accepts eService
(Representing Pittsburgh United)

ERIN FURE ESQUIRE*
TERESA REED WAGNER*
OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCATE
FORUM PLACE
555 WALNUT STREET 1ST FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.783.2525
efure@pa.gov
tereswagne@pa.gov

WHITNEY E. SNYDER ESQUIRE
THOMAS J. SNISCAK ESQUIRE
KEVIN J. MCKEON ESQUIRE
HAWKE, MCKEON AND SNISCAK, LLP
100 N 10TH STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.236.1300
wesnyder@hmslegal.com
tjsniscak@hmslegal.com
kjmckeon@hmslegal.com
Accepts eService
(Counsel for the City of Pittsburgh)

YVONNE HILTON ESQUIRE*
CITY OF PITTSBURGH
313 CITY-COUNTY BUILDING
414 GRANT STREET
PITTSBURGH PA 15219
412.255.2009
yvonne.hilton@pittsburghpa.gov

JOHN F. DOHERTY ESQUIRE
LAWRENCE H. BAUMILLER ESQUIRE
CITY OF PITTSBURGH DEPARTMENT OF LAW
414 GRANT STREET
313 CITY COUNTY BUILDING
PITTSBURGH PA 15220
412.255.2016
john.doherty@pittsburghpa.gov
lawrence.baumiller@pittsburghpa.gov
Accepts eService

PETER DEMARCO ESQUIRE*
JARED J. THOMPSON ESQUIRE*
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
1152 15TH STREET NORTHWEST, SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20005
202.513.2267
pdemarco@nrdc.org
jared.thompson@nrdc.org