1	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY:	Joanne Dahme, Philadelphia Water Department
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28		
28		

REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-86. PLEASE PROVIDE BY MONTH FOR EACH MONTH JULY 2017 TO PRESENT, THE

TOTAL NUMBER OF TAP PARTICIPANTS WITH PREPROGRAM

ARREARAGES.

RESPONSE:

PA-III-15.

The following table and explanatory text are provided in response to the question.

Month	Year	(a) Number of TAP Participants Having Preprogram Arrears at the Time of Enrollment	egate Dollars of Preprogram at the Time of Enrollment for ticipants
7	2017	-	\$ -
8	2017	719	\$ 2,747,995.45
9	2017	1,364	\$ 4,978,140.04
10	2017	1,906	\$ 6,661,080.65
11	2017	2,512	\$ 8,679,118.38
12	2017	3,759	\$ 13,097,555.63
1	2018	5,025	\$ 17,540,973.87
2	2018	5,932	\$ 20,808,472.54

(a) Number of TAP Participants Having Preprogram Arrears at the Time of Enrollment – This is the count of TAP Participants (distinct account keys issued a bill during the month in question as determined for PA-ADV-86 "(b) Total TAP Participants") that had Arrears > 0 at the time of enrollment (as determined for PA-ADV-86 "(c) Number of TAP New Enrollees Having Preprogram Arrears at the Time of Enrollment").

(b) Aggregate Dollars of Preprogram Arrears at the Time of Enrollment for TAP Participants – This is the sum of arrears of enrollees identified in PA-III-15(a).

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.

PA-III-16. REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-86. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW: A. IN AUGUST 2017, THERE WERE NEW TAP ENROLLEES OF 1,182 BUT A TOTAL TAP PARTICIPATION OF ONLY 763. B. IN SEPTEMBER 2017, THERE WERE 524 NEW ENROLLEES BUT THE TOTAL TAP PARTICIPATION RATE INCREASED FROM 763 TO 1,494 (731 INCREASE). **RESPONSE:** As described on page 113, lines 11 through 17 of the response to PA-ADV-86, TAP

participation is defined for a particular customer in a particular month if that customer is enrolled in TAP when a bill is issued. If a customer receives a regular bill in early August 2017, is enrolled in the program in late August 2017, and receives their next bill in early September 2017, this customer would be counted among New TAP Enrollees (PA-ADV-86(a)) in August, and among Total TAP Participants (PA-ADV-86(d)) in September. September Total TAP Participants (PA-ADV-86(d)) includes all customers who were enrolled in TAP prior to receiving their September bill.

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.

PA-III-17. REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-86. PLEASE PROVIDE
THE NUMBER OF WRAP PARTICIPANTS NOT PARTICIPATING IN
TAP FROM JANUARY 2017 TO PRESENT.

RESPONSE:

The table below shows the number of WRBCC participants not participating in TAP:

Month	Year	WRBCC Participants
1	2017	6,767
2	2017	7,139
3	2017	7,025
4	2017	6,647
5	2017	6,532
6	2017	6,559
7	2017	7,031
8	2017	6,264
9	2017	6,191
10	2017	5,847
11	2017	5,177
12	2017	4,660
1	2018	3,690
2	2018	3,483

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.

REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-86. CONFIRM OR DENY. A RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER, IN ANY GIVEN MONTH, IS EITHER A TAP PARTICIPANT OR IS NOT A TAP PARTICIPANT. THE POPULATION OF CUSTOMERS RECEIVING A TAP BILL AND THE POPULATION NOT RECEIVING A TAP BILL IN ANY GIVEN MONTH IS MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE. IF DENIED, PLEASE PROVIDE A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BASIS FOR THE DENIAL.

RESPONSE:

PA-III-20.

Denied. Generally, the population of customers receiving a TAP bill and the population not receiving a TAP bill in any given month is mutually exclusive. However, on the occasion that a customer receives multiple bills in a single calendar month, a customer could receive a regular bill, be enrolled in TAP, and subsequently receive a TAP bill in the same month.

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc

1	PA-III-24.	REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-86. CONFIRM OR DENY. THE
2		DOLLARS SET FORTH IN EACH AGE BUCKET (COLUMN L) ARE
3		ASSOCIATED WITH THE ACCOUNTS SET FORTH IN EACH BUCKET OF
4		THE SAME AGE (COLUMN K). THUS, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR NOVEMBER
5		(MONTH 11), THE \$632.75 (91-120 DAYS) ARE THE ARREARS
6		ASSOCIATED WITH THE 40 ACCOUNTS (91 – 120 DAYS). IF DENIED
7		PLEASE PROVIDE A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BASIS FOR THE
8		DENIAL AND SEPARATELY INDICATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
9		THE NUMBERS OF ACCOUNTS BY AGE BUCKET AND THE DOLLARS
10		OF ARREARS BY AGE BUCKET.
11		
12	RESPONSE:	
13	Confir	rmed.
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	RESPONSE	PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc.
28		

PA-III-27. REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-86. CONFIRM OR DENY. THE DOLLARS OF A TAP BILL CANNOT APPEAR IN THE 0 – 30 DAY AGE BUCKET IN MORE THAN ONE MONTH. IF DENIED, PLEASE PROVIDE A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BASIS FOR THE DENIAL.

RESPONSE:

Denied. All bills issued (aged 0 days) are included in Dollars of TAP Balance Aged 0-30 Days. If a second bill is issued within 30 days of the first bill and the first TAP bill remains unpaid, both the first bill (aged 30 days or less) and the second bill (aged 0 days) will be counted among Dollars of TAP Balance Aged 0-30 Days of the relevant month.

For example: Assume the first bill is issued in September 5th, and the second bill is issued 30 days later on October 5th. In September, the first bill (aged 0 days) will be counted among Dollars of TAP Balance Aged 0-30 Days. In October, the first bill (aged 30 days) and the second bill (aged 0 days) will be counted among Dollars of TAP Balance Aged 0-30 Days.

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc

November bill. 19 TAP participants had unpaid TAP balances aged 61-90 days at the time of their November bill. 40 TAP participants who had unpaid TAP balances aged 91-120 days at the time of their November bill. The same customer could have unpaid TAP bills aged 0-30, 31-60, 61-90, and 91-120 days at the time of their November bill. RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc

REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-86. CONFIRM OR DENY. IN EACH AGING BUCKET, THE NUMBER OF ACCOUNTS OR DOLLAR FIGURE IN ONE MONTH IS A SUBSET OF THE NUMBER OF ACCOUNTS OR DOLLAR FIGURE FOR THE IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING MONTH AND IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING AGING BUCKET. IF DENIED, PLEASE PROVIDE A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BASIS FOR THE DENIAL.

RESPONSE:

PA-III-29.

Denied. The unpaid balances and count of participants with those balances are measured in relation to the time elapsed since the bill was rendered. Because not all months are the same length and because customers are not always billed exactly once on exactly the same day each month, one aging buckets is not necessarily a subset of the prior month's aging bucket. Refer to the response to PA-III-30 for an example.

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc

PA-III-30. REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-86. CONFIRM OR DENY:

A. IN THE NUMBER OF ACCOUNTS (COLUMN K) IN NOVEMBER, THE 40 (91-120) IS A SUBSET OF THE 79 (61-90 FOR OCTOBER).

B. IN THE NUMBER OF ACCOUNTS FOR OCTOBER, THE 79 (61 - 90) I A SUBSET OF 189 (31-60 FOR SEPTEMBER).

C. FOR DOLLARS, THE \$632.72 (91 -120 IN NOVEMBER) IS A SUBSET OF \$1,220.35 (61 – 90 FOR OCTOBER).

D. THE \$1,220.35 (61 – 90 FOR OCTOBER) IS A SUBSET OF THE \$3,092.23 (31 – 60 FOR SEPTEMBER).

IF DENIED, PLEASE PROVIDE A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BASIS FOR THE DENIAL. SEPARATELY PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AGING BUCKETS OF ARREARS IN ONE MONTH (NUMBER OF ACCOUNTS AND DOLLARS OF ARREARS SEPARATELY IF THE EXPLANATION IS DIFFERENT) RELATE TO THE AGING BUCKETS OF ARREARS IN THE IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING MONTH.

RESPONSE:

Denied. The unpaid balances and count of participants with those balances are measured in relation to the time elapsed since the bill was rendered. Because not all months are the same length and because customers are not always billed exactly once on exactly the same day each month, one aging buckets is not necessarily a subset of the prior month's aging bucket.

Consider this example: A customer is issued a TAP bill on September 3rd. That bill remains unpaid. The customer is issued another TAP bill on October 4th (31 days later) and another on December 2nd (60 days later). Because that first bill remains unpaid,

1	that customer is counted among the Number of Participants With TAP Balance Aged
2	31-60 days in both October and November.
3	
4	
5	RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Raftelis Financial Consultants, Inc
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
2324	
2 4 25	
26	
20 27	
28	
_0	

PA-III-31. REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-52. CONFIRM OR DENY. THE PRIMARY FOCUS OF COMMENTS IN PENNSYLVANIA PUC DOCKET M-2015-2518883 WAS ON THE NEED FOR OR IMPACT OF REVENUE DECOUPLING ON THE PROMOTION OF EFFICIENCY INVESTMENTS. IF DENIED, PLEASE PROVIDE A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BASIS FOR THE DENIAL.

RESPONSE:

The primary focus of hearing, as indicated by the caption of the proceeding and as described by the PUC in its Notice to Interested Parties of December 31, 2015, and its Tentative Order entered on March 2, 2017, was "Alternative Ratemaking Methodologies." The PUCs' tentative order refers to revenue decoupling as one example of an alternative ratemaking methodology. See PUC Tentative Order, available on the PUC webpage at:

http://www.puc.state.pa.us/about_puc/consolidated_case_view.aspx?Docket=M-2015-2518883.

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Melissa LaBuda, Philadelphia Water Department

RESPONSE PROVIDED BY: Melissa LaBuda, Philadelphia Water Department

REFERENCE: PWD RESPONSE TO PA-ADV-52. PLEASE PROVIDE A COPY OF EACH SET OF COMMENTS AND/OR REPLY COMMENTS FILED BY A PENNSYLVANIA WATER UTILITY, OR OTHER STAKEHOLDERS THAT REFERENCED WATER/WASTEWATER RATEMAKING IN THEIR COMMENTS/REPLY COMMENTS, IN PENNSYLVANIA PUC DOCKET M-2015-2518883 THAT WAS REVIEWED BY PWD IN MAKING ITS ASSERTION THAT ITS DECISION WAS "BASED ON THE DEPARTMENT'S REVIEW OF WRITTEN COMMENT[S] IN THE PUC PROCEEDING" (REFERENCING PUC DOCKET M-2015-2518883).

RESPONSE:

PA-III-32.

The question contains an incorrect statement that the PWD's Response to PA-ADV-52 referred to a decision. Rather, the response stated that based on the Department's review of written comments in the PUC proceeding, it does not appear that a consensus had been reached concerning alternative ratemaking methodologies. Comments reviewed in making this statement include the comments of: (1) the Office of Consumer Advocate (March 16, 2017; May 31, 2017; and July 31, 2017), (2) the Office of Small Business Advocate (March 16, 2017; May 31, 2017; and July 31, 2017), (3) PGW (May 31, 2017); (4) PECO (March 16, 2016, May 31, 2017 and July 31, 2017); (5) Aqua (May 31, 2017); (6) the National Association of Water Companies (March 15, 2016); and (7) Pennsylvania-American Water Company (July 31, 2017).

These comments are available on the PUC webpage at:

http://www.puc.state.pa.us/about_puc/consolidated_case_view.aspx?Docket=M-2015-2518883.