

BEFORE THE
PHILADELPHIA WATER, SEWER AND STORM WATER RATE BOARD

In the Matter of the Philadelphia Water Department's Proposed Change in Water, Wastewater and Stormwater Rates and Charges	Fiscal Years 2026-2027
--	------------------------

**PHILADELPHIA WATER DEPARTMENT'S
INFORMATION REQUESTS TO THE
PUBLIC ADVOCATE, SET III**

The Philadelphia Water Department ("Department" or "PWD") requests that the Public Advocate provide full and complete answers to the following information requests (interrogatories and request for production of documents) upon the undersigned with seven calendar days of the service hereof.

Information Requests

Public Advocate Statement 3 (Colton):

1. With reference to PA Statement 3 (hereafter referred to as "your testimony") at pages 9-13 (Section A): How many households in Philadelphia are low income and NOT on an assistance program, such as TAP or the senior citizen discount program ("SCD")?
2. With reference to your testimony at page 9: How many households in Philadelphia are tenants who pay for water as a part of their rent?
3. With reference to your testimony at pages 9-13: How many households in Philadelphia captured in your analysis could be tenants who do not pay for water (and therefore are not customers) because their landlord pays the water bill for the property they lease?
4. With reference to your testimony at page 12 (Table 1): How many households in Philadelphia are in each of the income categories listed on the rows of the table?
5. With reference to your testimony at pages 13-24: Please confirm or deny that it is your testimony that the Rate Board should assume that the ALICE data from 2010 through 2021 for

Philadelphia households remains applicable in the current year (2025) and/or future years (2026-2027) within the Rate Period. Please provide evidence to support your answer.

6. With reference to your testimony at page 29: Please provide all workpapers in electronic format (with formulae intact) associated with the calculation that you use to arrive at the revenue adjustment of approximately \$8.4 million by “moving TAP discounts from TAP non-participants to the TAP Rider.” Please include the specific sources for all factors including the 70.09% collectability of bills of low-income customers outside of TAP.

7. With reference to your testimony at page 29: Please explain how your suggested change to the Rate Model by moving “TAP discounts from TAP non-participants to the TAP Rider” affects the TAP-R calculation.

8. With reference to your testimony at pages 32-33: Please provide any evidence to support your assumption that TAP customers pay or have paid lien fees as noticed on their bills.

9. With reference to your testimony at pages 32-33: Please provide further explanation, authority, or a specific customer example to support your assumption that a TAP payment could be applied to any portion of a TAP customer’s bill other than to the debt that earns forgiveness.

10. With reference to your testimony at page 33: Please provide a **specific** instance of when a TAP payment was ever applied to a lien fee on a customer’s account.

11. With reference to your testimony at page 33: Please provide a **specific** instance of a customer that did not receive expected forgiveness because a payment went to lien fees.

12. With reference to your testimony at page 37: Please describe a **specific** instance of harm or disadvantage that has made the use of water liens “unfair” to a TAP customer that you are aware of.

13. Confirm or Deny. Per the Municipal Claim and Tax Lien Act (“MCTLA”), timely filed liens result in appropriate credit priority when a property is sold or transferred, and therefore timely filed liens give PWD the best chance of receiving payment of water debt from a property transaction after other higher priority (IRS, Commonwealth, etc.) and older liens are paid first.

14. Confirm or Deny. If PWD did not file liens on TAP customers, and instead had to wait to file liens for unpaid water debt until the customer leaves TAP, those late filed liens lose their

place in line of priority to be paid behind higher priority liens (IRS, Commonwealth, etc.) and other debt instruments filed earlier in time. If your response is anything other than an unqualified “confirm,” please provide a detailed explanation and reasoning for the response.

15. Please provide an alternative method and associated costs to the current method that PWD uses to provide notice to the customer of a water lien(s) and associated lien fee(s).

16. Do you concede that, in response to PA-VIII-9, PWD described three CCF per household member per month as the threshold for identifying “high usage” customers for conservation assistance -- not as the median household consumption level? If you do not concede, please provide a detailed explanation and reasoning for the response.

17. With reference to your testimony on page 44 and footnote 61, please provide citations to the studies that you reference regarding Percentage of Income Programs and “price signals.”

18. Confirm or Deny. With reference to your testimony at pages 44-45: Please confirm or deny that your “conservation adjustment” also includes the increased cost of expanding LICAP to the TAP-R Rider calculation. If your response is anything other than an unqualified “confirm,” please explain your proposal for a recovery mechanism for the cost of providing increased conservation services and enforcement.

19. Please explain how reduced consumption by TAP participants and a resultant reduced TAP discount is relevant to the Base Rate proceeding. Please provide a detailed explanation and reasoning for your response.

20. Confirm or Deny. Not all Raise Your Hand customers qualify for TAP.

21. Confirm or Deny. Raise Your Hand customers can have any income level, including middle to high income-earning households.

22. With reference to your testimony at pages 52-53: Please provide additional explanation of how you calculated water bill payments from households in Raise Your Hand in your “savings” analysis. Additionally, please provide an explanation of how you calculated loss of revenue from water bills that go unpaid from households in Raise Your Hand.

23. Confirm or Deny. Households in the Raise Your Hand program do not continue to receive disconnect notices after entering the program, and therefore there would be no data to track for nonpayment disconnect notices, nonpayment disconnects, and reconnections.

24. Please provide the detailed step-by-step computations, including workpapers in electronic format (with formulae intact), if applicable, to explain the calculation for the \$477,186 and \$599,085 adjustments proposed on page 53 of your testimony. Please include underlying assumptions, data references, and formulae.

25. With reference to your testimony at pages 59-60: Please provide any substitute hardship funding that you are aware of (federal, state, nonprofit, private, etc.) that could replace hardship funds received from UESF historically.

26. Confirm or Deny. The Public Advocate supports additional increases in water rates in order for PWD to stand up a new, comparable program to UESF, including the costs associated with its administration and additional grants.

27. With reference to your testimony on page 73: Please confirm or deny that child support, Social Security Income and income issued by the Department of Welfare are examples of income that support minor children in a household, but would be “received by the customer” or other “adults residing in the customer’s household,” and therefore meet the definition for income to be included in the calculation of a customer’s TAP Bill per PWD Regulations. If your response is anything other than an unqualified “confirm,” please provide a detailed explanation and reasoning for the response.

28. With reference to your testimony at page 75: Please explain how the Advocate proposes to fund the cost of hiring an independent 3rd party auditor as recommended in your testimony.

29. Confirm or Deny: The cost to support new monthly and quarterly reporting that you recommend (on pages 51, 59, and 72) would be borne by PWD’s ratepayers. If your response is

anything other than an unqualified “confirm,” please provide a detailed explanation and reasoning for the response.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brooke Darlington

Brooke Darlington, Esquire
1950 Butler Pike
Conshohocken, Pennsylvania 19428

Andre Dasent, Esquire
Commerce Square
2001 Market Street, 25th Floor
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Of Counsel:
Adriana Gonzalez, Esquire
Neal Sellers, Esquire
Alexandra Athanasiadis, Esquire
Philadelphia Law Department
1101 Market Street, 5th Floor
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Carl R. Shultz, Esquire
Renardo Hicks, Esquire
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC
213 Market Street, 8th Floor
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101

Dated: May 5, 2025

Counsel to Water Revenue Bureau and
Philadelphia Water Department