FILED
February 16, 2018
INDIANA UTILITY
REGULATORY COMMISSION

STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF THE CITY)	
OF AUBURN, INDIANA BY ITS MUNICIPALLY-)	
OWNED WATER UTILITY FOR APPROVAL OF A)	
NEW SCHEDULE OF RATES AND CHARGES FOR)	CAUSE NO. 44985
WATER SERVICE AND AUTHORITY TO ISSUE)	
WATERWORKS REVENUE BONDS)	

OUCC SETTLEMENT TESTIMONY

OF

JENNIFER L. SISSON – PUBLIC'S EXIHIBIT NO. 5

ON BEHALF OF THE

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

FEBRUARY 16, 2018

Respectfully Submitted,

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

Daniel M. Le Vay, Atty. No. 22184-49

Deputy Consumer Counselor

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing *Office of Utility Consumer Counselor*Settlement Testimony of Jennifer L. Sisson has been served upon the following counsel of record in the captioned proceeding by electronic service on February 16, 2018.

Michael B. Cracraft Mark R Alson ICE MILLER LLP

One American Square, Ste. 2900 Indianapolis, IN 46282-0200

Email: <u>michael.cracraft@icemiller.com</u> <u>mark.alson@icemiller.com</u>

Daniel M. Le Vay

Deputy Consumer Counselor

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

115 West Washington Street Suite 1500 South Indianapolis, IN 46204 infomgt@oucc.in.gov 317/232-2494 – Phone 317/232-5923 – Facsimile

SETTLEMENT TESTIMONY OF OUCC WITNESS JENNIFER L. SISSON CAUSE NO. 44985 <u>CITY OF AUBURN</u>

1	Q:	Please state your name and business address.
2	A:	My name is Jennifer L. Sisson, and my business address is 115 West Washington
3		Street, Suite 1500 South, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.
4 5	Q:	Are you the same Jennifer L. Sisson who filed direct testimony in this cause on behalf of the OUCC?
6	A:	Yes.
7	Q:	What is the purpose of your settlement testimony?
8	A:	The purpose of my settlement testimony is to support the Stipulation and Settlement
9		Agreement ("Stipulations") between Auburn and the Indiana Office of Utility
10		Consumer Counselor ("OUCC") in this Cause.
11 12 13	Q:	What agreement did Auburn and the OUCC reach with respect to Auburn's requested approval of a new schedule of rates and charges for water service and authority to issue waterworks revenue bonds?
14	A:	The OUCC and Auburn agreed for purposes of compromise and settlement that
15		Auburn's current rates and charges for water service should be increased so as to
16		produce additional pro forma operating revenues of \$911,009, representing a
17		43.75% increase in rates and charges. The OUCC and Auburn agreed this increase
18		is to be applied on an across-the-board basis, as shown on Joint Settlement Exhibit
19		1.
20	Q:	Did the OUCC and Auburn agree to any further stipulations?
21	A:	Yes. The OUCC and Auburn reached agreement on all revenue requirements for
22		Auburn, which agreement is reflected in the accounting schedules attached as Joint

Settlement Exhibit No. 1. Auburn's total annual revenue requirement is \$3,035,079, and its net annual revenue requirement is \$3,034,405.

Q: Are there any other stipulations?

- 4 A: Yes. There are three additional stipulations.
 - 1. The OUCC and Auburn agreed that the amount of Petitioner's total test year *pro forma* operating revenues at present rates is \$2,136,150, which is the sum of revenues at current rates subject to increase of \$2,081,674 and other revenues not subject to increase of \$54,476 as set forth on Joint Settlement Exhibit 1.
 - 2. The OUCC and Auburn agreed that there shall be no surcharge added to the rates and charges for water customers located outside the municipal boundaries of Auburn.
 - 3. The OUCC and Auburn agreed that, subject to the Commission's approval, Auburn should be authorized to issue waterworks revenue bonds in a principal amount not to exceed \$3,330,000. The Settling Parties also agreed that the annual debt service amount of \$322,494 should be used to establish Auburn's annual *pro forma* revenue requirement, as reflected on Joint Settlement Exhibit 1. The Settling Parties further agreed that Auburn's rates should be trued-up to reflect the actual cost of the debt if the debt service amount is materially different from \$322,494. Therefore, Auburn agreed it would file a true-up report and revised tariff within thirty (30) days of closing on its debt issuance

Do you believe that the settlement is a fair, just and reasonable solution of all 1 Q: 2 the issues in this Cause? Yes. The settlement represents a reasonable compromise of the OUCC's and 3 A: Auburn's positions as set forth in their respective cases. As such, the testimony 4 provided in their respective cases together with all settlement testimony provides 5 an evidentiary basis to support the settlement. Further, I agree with Mr. Guerrettaz 6 that the settlement should be considered to be in the public interest. 7 Does this conclude your settlement testimony? 8 Q: 9 A: Yes.