STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

)

)

PETITION OF CWA AUTHORITY, INC. FOR (1) AUTHORITY TO INCREASE ITS RATES AND CHARGES FOR WASTEWATER UTILITY SERVICE IN THREE PHASES AND APPROVAL OF NEW SCHEDULES OF RATES AND CHARGES APPLICABLE THERETO; (2) APPROVAL OF A LOW-INCOME CUSTOMER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM; AND (3) APPROVAL OF CERTAIN CHANGES TO ITS GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR WASTEWATER SERVICE

CAUSE NO. 45151

SETTLEMENT TESTIMONY

OF

JEROME D. MIERZWA – PUBLIC'S EXHIBIT NO. 9

ON BEHALF OF THE

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

April 17, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel M. Le Vay, Atty. No. 22184-49 Deputy Consumer Counselor T. Jason Haas, Atty. No. 34983-29 Deputy Consumer Counselor

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing Office of Utility Consumer Counselor Settlement

Testimony of Jerome D. Mierzwa has been served upon the following counsel of record in the

captioned proceeding by electronic service on April 17, 2019.

Michael E. Allen Lauren Toppen CWA Authority, Inc. 2020 N. Meridian Street Indianapolis, IN 46202 E-mail: <u>mallen@citizensenergygroup.com</u> <u>Itoppen@citizensenergygroup.com</u>

<u>Courtesy copy to:</u> Korlon L. Kilpatrick Direct, Regulatory Affairs **CITIZENS ENERGY GROUP** 2020 North Meridian Street Indianapolis, IN 46202 E-mail: <u>kkilpatrick@citizensenergygroup.com</u> Michael B. Cracraft Steven W. Krohne ICE MILLER LLP One American Square, Suite 2900 Indianapolis, IN 46282-0200 E-mail: <u>michael.cracraft@icemiller.com</u> <u>steven.krohne@icemiller.com</u>

Jennifer A. Washburn Margo Tucker CITIZENS ACTION COALITION 1915 West 18th Street, Suite C Indianapolis, IN 46202 E-mail: jwashburn@citact.org mtucker@citact.org

Joseph P. Rompala Anne E. Becker Aaron A. Schmoll **LEWIS & KAPPES, P.C.** One American Square, Suite 2500 Indianapolis, IN 46282-0003 E-mail: <u>JRompala@Lewis-Kappes.com</u> <u>ABecker@Lewis-Kappes.com</u> <u>ASchmoll@Lewis-Kappes.com</u>

Jason Hass

Deputy Consumer Counselor

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

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

BEFORE THE INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

PETITION OF CWA AUTHORITY, INC.)	
FOR (1) AUTHORITY TO INCREASE)	
ITS RATES AND CHARGES FOR)	
WASTEWATER UTILITY SERVICE IN)	
THREE PHASES AND APPROVAL OF)	
NEW SCHEDULE OF RATES AND)	
CHARGES APPLICABLE THERETO; (2))	CAUSE NO. 45151
APPROVAL OF A LOW-INCOME)	
CUSTOMER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM;)	
AND (3) APPROVAL OF CERTAIN)	
CHANGES TO ITS GENERAL TERMS)	
AND CONDITIONS FOR)	
WASTEWATER SERVICE)	

VERIFIED TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT

of

JEROME D. MIERZWA

On Behalf of

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

April 17, 2019



ASSOCIATES, INC. 10480 Little Patuxent Parkway, Suite 300 Columbia, Maryland 21044

VERIFIED TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT OF JEROME D. MIERZWA CAUSE NO. 45151 <u>CWA AUTHORITY, INC.</u>

1		I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>
2	Q.	WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?
3	A.	My name is Jerome D. Mierzwa. I am a principal and Vice President of Exeter
4		Associates, Inc. ("Exeter"). My business address is 10480 Little Patuxent Parkway,
5		Suite 300, Columbia, Maryland 21044. Exeter specializes in providing public utility-
6		related consulting services.
7	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY IN THIS
8		PROCEEDING?
9	A.	Yes. My direct testimony was submitted on January 25, 2019, as Public's Exhibit No.
10		6, and my cross-answering testimony was submitted on February 21, 2019.
11	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
12	A.	The purpose of this testimony is to provide the Commission with the background for,
13		and explain certain terms of, the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement ("Agreement")
14		reached by the CWA Authority, Inc. ("CWA" or Petitioner"), the Indiana Office of
15		Utility Consumer Counselor ("OUCC"), the CWA Authority Industrial Group
16		("Industrial Group"), Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana, and the Indiana Community
17		Association, Inc. (collectively "Parties") which was filed on April 12, 2019. The
18		Agreement resolves all issues raised in this proceeding with the exception of the
19		OUCC's recommendation that CWA retain ownership of the grinder pumps it has
20		"installed and use its maintenance staff to provide emergency response and repair for
21		the grinder pumps and ongoing pump replacements when they reach the end of their

Verified Settlement Testimony of Jerome D. Mierzwa

service lives" and associated recommendations regarding additions to Petitioner's
 revenue requirements relating to such responsibilities (Public's Exh. 4 at 48). More
 specifically, my testimony addresses the cost allocation and rate design aspects of the
 Agreement. OUCC witness Margaret Stull addresses the revenue requirement aspects
 of the Agreement. My testimony concludes by recommending the Commission
 approve the Agreement.

7

II. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

8 Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE HISTORY LEADING UP TO THE 9 EXECUTION OF THE AGREEMENT.

10 A. The Agreement is the product of negotiations that occurred prior to the hearings in this 11 Cause, which were initially scheduled to begin on March 18, 2019. More specifically, 12 on March 15, 2019, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Continue Evidentiary Hearing and Withdrawal of Objection and Motion to Strike ("Motion"). In the Motion, the 13 14 Parties advised that a settlement on less than all issues was expected to be reached in 15 this Cause. The Parties requested that the Commission continue the evidentiary hearing expected to begin on March 18, 2019 to March 20, 2019. The Parties explained that 16 17 the continuance would allow them to complete negotiations and file a subsequent 18 motion to set a date for a hearing on the issues that the Parties have settled and to 19 suggest a procedural schedule to address any issues that have not been settled. This 20 Motion was granted by the Presiding Officers. The Motion also required the Parties to 21 file on March 19, 2019 a proposed procedural schedule and outline the unsettled issues. 22 On March 19, 2019 a proposed procedural schedule and outline of the unsettled 23 issues in this Cause was submitted by the Parties, as well as an agreement regarding the proposed procedural schedule and unsettled issues. The Parties indicated that they 24 25 would file a Stipulation and Settlement Agreement setting forth their agreement as to

Verified Settlement Testimony of Jerome D. Mierzwa

- all settled issues in this proceeding, as well as supporting testimony and exhibits, on or
 before April 12, 2019.
 Q. DOES THE AGREEMENT RESOLVE THE COST ALLOCATION AND
 RATE DESIGN ISSUES RAISED BY THE PARTIES TO THIS
 PROCEEDING IN THEIR RESPECTIVE TESTIMONIES AND EXHIBITS?
- A. Yes, the Agreement resolves all of the issues related to cost allocation and rate design
 in this Cause raised by the Parties.

8 Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY THE CUSTOMER CLASSES AND SERVICES

9

PROVIDED BY CWA.

A. The Non-Industrial class consists of customers that generally discharge domestic
strength wastewater and are billed based on their metered water consumption. Typical
customers in this class are residential, commercial, or multi-family type customers.
This class also includes the unmetered residential and commercial customers.
Residential and multi-family customers are currently billed based on their actual usage
during the winter months (i.e., December through April) and winter period average
usage during the summer months (i.e., May through November).

17 The Self-Reporter and Industrial class generally consists of industrial and other 18 customers who measure their wastewater discharge to the CWA system and self-report 19 the volumes to CWA on a monthly basis. The volume charge for these customers 20 includes a surveillance charge related to CWA's cost for monitoring these self-21 reporting customers. Self-Reporter customers also report excess loadings or concentrations of Biochemical Oxygen Demand ("BOD"), Total Suspended Solids 22 23 ("TSS"), and Ammonia-Nitrogen ("NH₃-N") above CWA's established limits of 250 24 milligrams per liter (mg/l) BOD; 300 mg/l TSS; and 20 mg/l of NH₃-N.

Verified Settlement Testimony of Jerome D. Mierzwa

1		Wastewater Haulers consist of Septic and Non-grease Haulers who bring
2		trucked waste directly to the Belmont Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant where it
3		is discharged for treatment and disposal. The concentration of discharge BOD, TSS,
4		and NH ₃ -N is typically much higher than normal strength wastewater.
5		Fats, Oil, and Grease ("FOG") customers are generally Non-Industrial,
6		commercial-type customers that are licensed to cook and prepare food. CWA monitors
7		these customers for the proper disposal of grease from their operations.
8		Satellite customers are communities adjacent to the CWA system that own and
9		operate their own wastewater collection systems. These customers discharge their
10		wastewater to CWA for conveyance and treatment. CWA provides service to some of
11		these customers via Special Contracts for service and to others via Sewer Rate No. 6.
12		III. SETTLEMENT OF COST ALLOCATION AND RATE DESIGN ISSUES
13	Q.	WHAT WAS THE IMPETUS BEHIND THE PARTIES' AGREEMENT WITH
14		RESPECT TO RESOLUTION OF THE COST ALLOCATION AND RATE
15		DESIGN ISSUES?
16	А.	The Parties' Agreement relating to resolution of the cost allocation and rate design
17		issues was structured to reach a mutually acceptable resolution of these issues and avoid
18		the risk, expense, and administrative burden of further litigation. The Agreement is the
19		result of arms-length bargaining between and among the Parties. While each Party
20		presenting cost allocation and rate design testimony and exhibits strongly believed in
21		its respective position, they were able to put aside those differences and agree upon a
22		resolution of these issues that avoids litigation, generally moves the revenues from each
23		class toward the allocated cost-of-service as determined in CWA's case-in-chief, and
24		falls within the range of potential outcomes proposed by the Parties, if the case had
25		been litigated.

Verified Settlement Testimony of Jerome D. Mierzwa

.

,

1 2

Q.

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THE AGREEMENT ON THE REVENUES TO BE RECOVERED BY CWA?

The Agreement provides for an increase of \$57.8 million in CWA operating revenues 3 A. 4 in three steps or phases. More specifically, the Agreement provides for an operating 5 revenue increase of \$31.9 million, or 11.9 percent, effective upon the date of the 6 Commission's Order in this Cause; an additional increase of \$13.9 million, or 4.6 percent, shall be implemented upon the filing of the Official Statement for the open-7 8 market 2020 bonds and, if applicable, State Revolving Fund pre-closing and closing 9 documents; and an additional increase of \$12.0 million, or 3.8 percent, shall be 10 implemented upon the filing of the Official Statement for the open-market 2021 bonds 11 and, if applicable, State Revolving Fund pre-closing and closing documents. The 12 revenues recovered from each customer class under existing rates, the increase in 13 revenues under each phase of the Agreement, and the revenues to be recovered from 14 each class under each phase of the proposed Agreement are identified in Table 1. In 15 addition, the Agreement provides for an increase to monthly base charge for the Non-16 Industrial class from \$18.75 to \$21.75 for Phases 1, 2, and 3.

Table 1. CWA AUTHORITY, INC. Comparison of Present and Settlement Rates				
PHASE I Class	Present Rates	Settlement Rates	Increase	Percent Increase
Non-Industrial	\$220,283,400	\$251,196,262	\$30,912,862	14.03%
Self-Reporter	22,939,500	23,883,109	943,609	4.11%
Strength Surcharge	14,758,600	13,324,098	(1,434,502)	-9.72%
Septic Haulers	152,600	152,600	0	0.00%
Commercial FOG	1,374,600	1,374,600	0	0.00%
Satellite-Special Contract	5,769,900	7,045,100	1,275,200	22.10%
Satellite-Tariff	686,100	858,900	172,800	25.19%
Other Revenue	2,373,100	2,373,100	0	0.00%
TOTAL	\$268,337,800	\$300,207,769	\$31,869,969	11.88%
PHASE II		Settlement		Percent
Class	Present Rates	Rates	Increase	Increase
Non-Industrial	\$251,196,262	\$262,665,381	\$11,469,119	4.57%
Self-Reporter	23,883,109	\$24,851,080	967,971	4.05%
Strength Surcharge	13,324,098	\$13,324,098	0	0.00%
Septic Haulers	152,600	\$152,600	0	0.00%
Commercial FOG	1,374,600	\$1,374,600	0	0.00%
Satellite-Special Contract	7,045,100	\$8,497,200	1,452,100	20.61%
Satellite-Tariff	858,900	\$900,800	41,900	4.88%
Other Revenue	2,373,100	\$2,373,100	0	0.00%
TOTAL	\$300,207,769	\$314,138,859	\$13,931,090	4.64%
PHASE III		Settlement		Percent
Class	Present Rates	Rates	Increase	Increase

	+	Settlement		Percent
Class	Present Rates	Rates	Increase	Increase
Non-Industrial	\$262,665,381	\$272,065,451	9,400,070	3.58%
Self-Reporter	\$24,851,080	\$25,634,513	783,433	3.15%
Strength Surcharge	\$13,324,098	\$13,324,098	0	0.00%
Septic Haulers	\$152,600	\$152,600	0	0.00%
Commercial FOG	\$1,374,600	\$1,374,600	0	0.00%
Satellite-Special Contract	\$8,497,200	\$10,256,700	1,759,500	20.71%
Satellite-Tariff	\$900,800	\$932,700	31,900	3.54%
Other Revenue	\$2,373,100	\$2,373,100	0	0.00%
TOTAL	\$314,138,859	\$326,113,762	11,974,903	3.81%
4	·····			

1		The Agreement provides for a distribution of the revenue increase in a manner
2		that could have resulted from the various positions of the parties. All of the Parties,
3		however, moved from their respective litigation positions in order to arrive at a
4		compromise.
5	Q.	DO YOU BELIEVE COMMISSION APPROVAL OF THE AGREEMENT IS
6		IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?
7	A.	Yes, for the reasons I have discussed, I believe the Agreement is in the public interest.
8		The Agreement resolves contentious issues without the need for protracted litigation
9		and provides for a reasonable revenue allocation by class that falls within the evidence
10		of record in this Cause.
11		
11		IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
11	Q.	IV. <u>CONCLUSION</u> IN YOUR OPINION, DO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REPRESENT
	Q.	
12	Q.	IN YOUR OPINION, DO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REPRESENT
12 13	Q. A.	IN YOUR OPINION, DO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REPRESENT A REASONABLE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUES RAISED REGARDING
12 13 14	-	IN YOUR OPINION, DO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REPRESENT A REASONABLE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUES RAISED REGARDING COST ALLOCATION AND RATE DESIGN?
12 13 14 15	A.	IN YOUR OPINION, DO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REPRESENT A REASONABLE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUES RAISED REGARDING COST ALLOCATION AND RATE DESIGN? In my opinion, yes.
12 13 14 15 16	А. Q.	IN YOUR OPINION, DO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REPRESENT A REASONABLE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUES RAISED REGARDING COST ALLOCATION AND RATE DESIGN? In my opinion, yes. WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND TO THE COMMISSION?
12 13 14 15 16 17	А. Q.	IN YOUR OPINION, DO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REPRESENT A REASONABLE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUES RAISED REGARDING COST ALLOCATION AND RATE DESIGN? In my opinion, yes. WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND TO THE COMMISSION? I find the Agreement reasonable and I recommend the Commission approve the
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	А. Q. А.	IN YOUR OPINION, DO THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT REPRESENT A REASONABLE RESOLUTION OF THE ISSUES RAISED REGARDING COST ALLOCATION AND RATE DESIGN? In my opinion, yes. WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND TO THE COMMISSION? I find the Agreement reasonable and I recommend the Commission approve the Agreement.

VERIFICATION

STATE OF MARYLAND)	
)	ss:
COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGES)	

The undersigned, Jerome D. Mierzwa, under penalties of perjury and being first duly sworn on his oath, says that he is a Consultant for the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor; that he caused to be prepared and read the foregoing; that the representations set forth therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.

By Jerome D. Mierzwa Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public, this \underline{IZ} day of \underline{April} , 2019.

Signature Deborah M Adams

My Commission Expires: 2/202 3

My County of Residence:

DEBORAH M ADAMS Notary Public State of Maryland Howard County

Hower,