

**DOCKET** 950495-WS  
**EXHIBIT NO.** 132  
**JAMES BEECHER, PH.D.**  
**CASE NO.** 96-04227

Docket No. 950495-WS  
Florida Public Service Commission  
JAB-1  
Page 1 of 13

**Center for Urban Policy and the Environment  
School of Public and Environmental Affairs  
Indiana University, Indianapolis  
Office: (317) 261-3047**

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

*Senior Research Scientist and Director of Regulatory Studies.* Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University. Indianapolis, Indiana. April 1995 to Present. Principal investigator and analyst for regulatory and environmental research and director of the regulatory studies program focusing on research related to the structure and regulation of the water utility regulation. Responsible for the program's research agenda, funding and development, and clearinghouse functions. Serve as liaison to federal and state regulators and policymakers, professional associations, university faculty, and others interested in water utility and regulatory issues.

*Adjunct Professor.* School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, Indianapolis. August 1995 to present. Teach graduate and undergraduate courses in public policy. Special adjunct faculty appointments at The Ohio State University and Southern Illinois University for graduate student committees.

*Senior Institute Research Specialist.* The National Regulatory Research Institute, The Ohio State University. Columbus, Ohio. November 1988 to Present. Principal project manager and regulatory analyst for water utility research; assisted in setting the research agenda, funding and grant development, and external relations; member of the staff subcommittee of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) Water Committee; liaison to state commissioners and staff, federal agencies, university faculty, professional associations, and others interested in water utility and regulatory issues; organizer and moderator for the Water Policy Forum at the Biennial Regulatory Information Conference; and instructor for new commissioner tutorial and other educational programs. Recipient of the 1991 Board of Directors award for excellence; honored by a NARUC resolution in 1995.

*Adjunct Associate Professor.* School of Public Policy and Management, The Ohio State University. Columbus, Ohio. February 1994 to April 1995. Taught two graduate-level public policy courses, served as a faculty and research advisor to graduate students; sat on graduate student committees; and participated in faculty colloquia.

*Policy Advisor to the Chairman.* Illinois Commerce Commission. Chicago, Illinois. November 1983 to October 1988. Principal policy analyst, project coordinator, and advisor to the Chairman on matters of administration, legislation, and regulatory policy affecting the electricity, gas, telecommunications,

**FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**  
DOCKET NO. 950495-WS EXHIBIT NO. 132 DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE  
COMPANY/ Fpsc/Beecher 02343 FEB 26 88  
WITNESS: 4/29/96 FPSC-REGGROS/REPORTING  
DATE: 4/29/96

JANICE A. BEECHER, Ph.D.

---

Page 2

transportation, and water industries; Chairman's liaison to other commissioners, the executive director and division managers, state and federal agencies, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, the media, and the general public; author of numerous policy memoranda and speeches.

*Associate Investigator.* Study of the Precision of Environmental Impact Assessment, funded by the National Science Foundation. Center for Urban Affairs & Policy Research, Northwestern University, 1982 to 1983. Provided project management with primary responsibility for sample selection and coding, planned field research, interviewed knowledgeable informants and collected data, assisted in data management and statistical analysis, conducted investigation of policy implementation and nonimplementation, and coauthored final report.

*Research Associate.* Governmental Responses to Crime Project, funded by the National Institute of Justice. Center for Urban Affairs & Policy Research, Northwestern University, 1980 to 1982. Completed a study of political responses to crime in American cities using interviews with knowledgeable informants and other sources, provided data management, and coauthored final report.

*Research Associate.* Wind Energy Research Project, funded by the Solar Energy Research Institute. Center for Urban Affairs & Policy Research, Northwestern University, 1980. Designed and conducted field research and coauthored final research report.

*Research Associate.* Illinois Sunset Review Project, funded by the Illinois General Assembly. Department of Political Science, University of Illinois at Chicago, 1980. Researched federal impacts on state licensure and coauthored final report to the Illinois legislature.

*Teaching Assistant.* Department of Political Science, Northwestern University, 1980. Aided instructors for American presidency and law and politics courses, assisted undergraduate students, and graded papers and examinations.

*Banking.* Elmhurst Federal Savings and Loan and Elmhurst National Bank, Elmhurst, Illinois. 1974 to 1979.

## EDUCATION

*Ph.D. Northwestern University, August 1986.* Political Science.

Major: Public Policy. Minors: Political Behavior & Institutions, Law & Politics, and Urban Politics.

Dissertation: *Uncertain by Design: A Structural Theory of Regulation by the State Public Utility Commissions.*

*M.A. Northwestern University, August 1980.* Political Science.

M.A. Thesis: *When Governments Intervene: The Adoption of Regulatory Policy in the American States.*

---

JANICE A. BEECHER, PH.D.

---

Page 3

*B.A. Elmhurst College, June 1979. Economics, Political Science, and History.*

Phi Kappa Phi (the college's ranking scholastic honors society). Graduated with highest honors.

*Scholarships*

Northwestern University Scholarship, 1982-1983.

Northwestern University, Center for Urban Affairs & Policy Research Fellowship,  
1981-1982 and 1980-1981.

Northwestern University Fellowship, 1979-1980.

Elmhurst College Freshman Scholar, 1977-1978.

**PAPERS AND PUBLICATIONS**

**Books, Monographs, and Reports**

Janice A. Beecher. *1995 Inventory of Commission-Regulated Water and Wastewater Utilities.* Indianapolis: Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, 1995.

Janice A. Beecher. *Discussion Paper for the NAWC Water Policy Forum.* Prepared for the National Association of Water Companies (NAWC). Indianapolis: Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, 1995.

Paul G. Foran, Janice A. Beecher, and Larry J. Wilson. *Survey of Eastern Water Law.* A Report to the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (Springfield, Illinois), 1995.

Janice A. Beecher, G. Richard Dreese, and John D. Stanford. *Regulatory Implications of Water and Wastewater Utility Privatization.* Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, 1995.

Robert E. Burns, Janice A. Beecher, et al. *Alternatives to Utility Service Disconnection.* Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, 1995.

Janice A. Beecher, et al. *Revenue Effects of Water Conservation and Conservation Pricing Issues and Practices.* Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, September 1994.

Janice A. Beecher and Patrick C. Mann. *Meeting Water Utility Revenue Requirements: Financing and Ratemaking Alternatives.* Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, November 1993.

Janice A. Beecher and G. Richard Dreese. *Viability Policies and Assessment Methods for Small Water Utilities.* Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, June 1992.

Janice A. Beecher and Nancy N. Zearfoss. *1992 NRRI Survey on Commission Ratemaking Practices for Water Utilities.* Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, May 1992.

**JANICE A. BEECHER, PH.D.**

---

**Page 4**

Janice A. Beecher, James R. Landers, and Patrick C. Mann. *Integrated Resource Planning for Water Utilities*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, October 1991.

Janice A. Beecher and Patrick C. Mann. *Cost Allocation and Rate Design for Water Utilities*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, December 1990.

Janice A. Beecher and Patrick C. Mann. *Deregulation and Regulatory Alternatives for Water Utilities*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, March 1990.

Janice A. Beecher and Ann P. Laubach. *Compendium on Water Supply and Conservation*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, October 1989.

Janice A. Beecher and Ann. P. Laubach. *1989 Survey on State Commission Regulation of Water and Sewer Systems*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, May 1989.

Patrick C. Mann and Janice A. Beecher. *Cost Impact of Safe Drinking Water Act Compliance for Commission-Regulated Water Utilities*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, May 1989.

Paul J. Culhane, H. Paul Friesema, and Janice A. Beecher. *Forecasts and Environmental Decisionmaking: The Content and Predictive Accuracy of Environmental Impact Statements*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1987.

Paul J. Culhane, H. Paul Friesema, and Janice A. Beecher. "The Precision of Environmental Impact Assessment: Implementation Status and Sample Selection." CUAPR Working Paper Series. Evanston, IL: Center for Urban Affairs & Policy Research, September 1982.

H. Paul Friesema, Janice A. Beecher, and Cleveland Fraser. *Blowing in the Wind: The Prospects of Utility Adoption of Wind Energy Systems*. Report to the Solar Energy Institute. Indianapolis, IN: The Institute of Ecology, 1980.

#### **Articles, Chapters, and Proceedings**

Janice A. Beecher. "The Role of Demand Management in Integrated Resource Planning," in Duane Baumann, ed., *Urban Water Demand Management and Planning*. Forthcoming in 1996.

Janice A. Beecher and Patrick C. Mann. "Integrating Marginal-Cost and Embedded-Cost Approaches in Water Utility Pricing," *American Water Works Association Journal*. Forthcoming in 1996 (completed and accepted).

---

**JANICE A. BEECHER, Ph.D.**

---

**Page 5**

- Janice A. Beecher and Patrick C. Mann. "The Role of Price in Water Conservation: Evidence and Issues," *Proceedings of Conserv96*. Denver, Colorado: American Water Works Association, 1996.
- Thomas W. Chesnutt, et al. "Handbook for Designing, Evaluating, and Implementing Conservation Rates," *Proceedings of Conserv96*. Denver, Colorado: American Water Works Association, 1996.
- Janice A. Beecher, et al. "Public-Private Partnerships for Providing Water Service," AWWA Roundtable. *American Water Works Association Journal*. Forthcoming in 1996 (recorded in June 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Integrated Resource Planning Fundamentals," *American Water Works Association Journal* 87, no. 6 (June 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "PUC 2000: The Water Utility Industry," *NAWC Water* (Summer 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Regulatory Alternatives for Water Utilities: A Comprehensive Framework," *NRRI Quarterly Bulletin* 16, no. 1 (March 1995): 103-119.
- Janice A. Beecher. "Water Affordability and Alternatives to Service Disconnection," *American Water Works Association Journal* 86, no. 10 (October 1994): 61-72.
- Janice A. Beecher. "NRRI Survey on Water Conservation and Conservation Pricing," *Proceedings of the NRRI Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, September 1994.
- G. Richard Dreese and Janice A. Beecher. "Financial Distress Assessment Models for Small Water Utilities." *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association*. Denver, CO: American Water Works Association, 1994.
- Janice A. Beecher, et al. "IRP: An Open Planning Process," AWWA Roundtable. *American Water Works Association Journal* 85, no. 8 (August 1993): 26-34.
- G. Richard Dreese and Janice A. Beecher. "Developing Models for Assessing the Financial Health of Small and Medium-Size Water Utilities," *American Water Works Association Journal* 85, no. 6 (June 1993): 54-60.
- G. Richard Dreese and Janice A. Beecher. "Financial Distress Assessment Models for Small Water Utilities," *Proceedings of the NRRI Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, September 1992.
- Janice A. Beecher. "Enhanced Regulatory Decisionmaking Through Integrated Water Resource Planning," *Proceedings of the NRRI Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, September 1992.

JANICE A. BEECHER, PH.D.

---

Page 6

- Patrick C. Mann and Janice A. Beecher. "Marginal Cost Pricing Theory Applied to Water Utilities," *Proceedings of the NRRI Biennial Regulatory Information Conference*. Columbus, OH: The National Regulatory Research Institute, September 1990.
- Janice A. Beecher. "Value, Cost, and Price: Essay on Emerging Water Utility Issues," *NRRI Quarterly Bulletin*, June 1990. Also published in *NAWC Water*, Summer 1990.
- Gary J. Andres and Janice A. Beecher. "Applied Political Science: Bridging the Gap or a Bridge Too Far?" *PS: Political Science & Politics*, September 1989.
- Janice A. Beecher, Robert L. Lineberry, and Michael J. Rich. "Community Power, the Urban Agenda, and Crime Policy," *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 2, December 1981.
- Janice A. Beecher, Robert L. Lineberry, and Michael J. Rich. "The Politics of Police Responses to Urban Crime." In Dan A. Lewis, ed., *Reactions to Crime*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1981.
- Janice A. Beecher and Robert L. Lineberry. "Attentiveness to Crime in Political Arenas." In Herbert Jacob, Robert L. Lineberry, et al., *Crime on Urban Agendas*. Report of the Governmental Responses to Crime Project, Northwestern University. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, 1982.
- Janice A. Beecher. "Federal Impacts on State Occupational Licensure." In Charles Williams, et al., *Illinois Sunset Review Project: Final Report*. Chicago: University of Illinois, 1980.

#### Papers and Presentations

- Janice A. Beecher. "Global Aspects of Water Utility Privatization and Regulation," at a conference of the Institute for Global Climate Change, Indiana University, Bloomington (March 1996, paper accepted).
- Janice A. Beecher. Panel participant on "Musings on the Post-ULV Era," at the *Conserv96* conference in Orlando (January 1996).
- Janice A. Beecher. Panel participant on "Environmental Public-Private Partnerships-Setting the Tone for the Future," at the Annual Conference of the National Council for Public-Private Partnerships in Chicago, Illinois (October 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Regulatory Implications of Water and Wastewater Utility Privatization." A presentation to the Illinois Commerce Commission in Springfield, Illinois (October 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Structure and Regulation of the Water Utility Industry: Changes and Challenges." A presentation at the Utilities Conference of the Indiana CPA Society (October 1995).

**JANICE A. BEECHER, Ph.D.**

---

**Page 7**

- Janice A. Beecher. Panel participant in the *Water Policy Forum* of the National Association of Water Companies in Naples, Florida (September 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Water Demand, Prices, and Revenues: The Effects of Conservation." Presentation at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association in Anaheim, California (June 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. Moderator for "Reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act" at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-America Regulatory Conference in Indianapolis, Indiana (June 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Emerging Issues in Benchmarking and Performance-Based Water Utility Regulation." Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the New England Chapter of the National Association of Water Companies in Kennebunkport, Maine (May 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Regulatory Implications of Water Utility Privatization: Research Findings." Presentation at the Water Committee Seminar of the Winter Meeting of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners in Washington, D.C. (February 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "The Water Industry: Coordinating Regulatory Functions and Resource Planning." Presentation to the Select Committee on Water Policy of the Florida House of Representatives in Tallahassee, Florida (February 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Emerging Regulatory Requirements for Conservation and IRP." Presentation at the American Water Works Association Water Conservation Workshop in Santa Fe, New Mexico (January 1995).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Managing Watersheds for the Twenty-First Century: An Integrated Planning Perspective." Panelist at the Wayne Nichols Program, School of Natural Resources, The Ohio State University (November 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Impacts of Legislative Regulations." Panelist at the Annual Conference of the Water Management Association of Ohio (November 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Integrated Approaches to Resource Planning and Environmental Protection." Organizer and moderator at the Public Policy Roundtable on Business and the Environment, School of Public Policy, The Ohio State University (October 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Regulatory Excellence for the 21st Century." Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Water Companies in Scottsdale, Arizona (October 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Financial Distress Assessment Models for Small Water Utilities." Presentation at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association in New York (June 1994).
-

**JANICE A. BEECHER, PH.D.**

---

**Page 8**

- Janice A. Beecher. "Decision Analysis for Integrated Resource Planning." Moderating panelist at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association in New York (June 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "General Summary of the NRRI State Commission Survey on Water Conservation Pricing and Revenue Recovery Issues." Presentation to the Committee on Rates and Charges at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association in New York (June 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Economic Regulation of Water Utilities in the United States." Presentation to a delegation from Argentina (ETOSS) in Washington, D.C. (April 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Economic Regulation of Water Utilities in the United States." Presentation at the World Bank, Workshop on Institutional Options for Price Regulation of Water Utilities (April 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Water Utilities and the Environment." Presentation at the Annual Technical Conference of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners in Washington, D.C. (February 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Incentive Regulation for Water Utilities." Presentation at the Water Committee Seminar at the Winter Meeting of National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners in Washington, D.C. (February 1994).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Integrated Resource Planning for Water Utilities." Presentation at Conserv93 in Las Vegas, Nevada (December 1993).
- Janice A. Beecher. "The Role of the State Public Utility Commissions in Water Conservation." Moderator for an affinity group at Conserv93 in Las Vegas, Nevada (December 1993).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Institutional Roles and Responsibilities for Integrated Water Resource Planning: Discussion Paper." Paper prepared for the Water Industry Technical Action Fund (WITAF) and presented at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association in San Antonio, Texas (June 1993).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Consensus Building for Integrated Water Resource Planning: Discussion Paper." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Water Works Association in San Antonio, Texas (June 1993).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Integrated Water Resource Planning: Discussion Paper." Paper prepared for the Water Industry Technical Action Fund (February 1993).
- Janice A. Beecher. Panel presentation on Water Utility Regulatory Issues at the New England Chapter of the National Association of Water Companies in Plymouth, Massachusetts (June 1992).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Economic and Regulatory Impacts of the Safe Drinking Water Act." Paper presented at the New England Conference of Public Utility Commissioners (May 1992).

**JANICE A. BEECHER, Ph.D.**

**Page 9**

- Janice A. Beecher. "Contemporary Water Issues." Presentation to the Energy and Public Utilities Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly in Hartford, Connecticut (January 1992).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Small Systems Solutions." Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Water Companies in St. Louis, Missouri (October 1990).
- Patrick C. Mann and Janice A. Beecher. "The Cost and Rate Impact of the Safe Drinking Water Act." Paper presented at the Iowa State Regulatory Conference in Ames, Iowa (May 1990).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Economics of Future Water Supplies." Presentation at the Conference on Water Sufficiency for the 21st Century Sponsored by the International Center for Water Resources Management, Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio (May 1990).
- Janice A. Beecher. "State Regulatory Issues in the Age of Discovery." Presentation at the American Water System Annual Management Seminar. Columbus, Ohio (May 1989).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Value, Cost, and Price: Essay on Emerging Water Utility Issues." Paper presented at the Symposium on International and Transboundary Water Resources Issues in Toronto, Ontario (April 1990).
- Janice A. Beecher. "State Public Utility Commissions and State Drinking Water Administrators: A Case for Interagency Coordination." Presentation at the Environmental Protection Agency's Workshop on Financing Strong State Water Programs in Denver, Colorado (April 1989).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Applying Political Science." Panelist on the Applied Political Science Panel, Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois (September 1987).
- H. Paul Friesema with Janice A. Beecher. "The Unclear Connection Between the Scientific Quality of Environmental Impact Statements and Public Policy: Experience in the USA." Paper delivered by H. Paul Friesema at the International Seminar on the Role of Environmental Assessment in the Decisionmaking Process in Heidelberg, Federal Republic of Germany (August 1987).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Agricultural Energy Consumption and Conservation in Illinois: An Overview." Research paper prepared for the Illinois Commerce Commission (October 1984).
- Janice A. Beecher. "Utility Taxation and Consumer Costs in Illinois: A Statistical Report." Research paper prepared for the Illinois Commerce Commission (May 1984).
- Janice A. Beecher, Robert L. Lineberry, and Michael J. Rich. "Crime in the Cities: Politics and Policy Over a Generation." Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association in Cincinnati, Ohio (April 1981).

JANICE A. BEECHER, PH.D.

---

Page 10

### Instructional Books

Janice A. Beecher. *Study Guide, Instructor's Manual, and Test Bank* to accompany Karen O'Connor and Larry Sabato's *American Government: Roots and Reform*. New York: Macmillan, 1993 edition. *Study Guide*, 1995 edition.

Janice A. Beecher. *Test Bank* to accompany *Empty Dreams, Empty Pockets*. New York, Macmillan, 1993.

Janice A. Beecher. *Study Guide* to accompany Robert L. Lineberry's *Government in America*. Boston: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown, 1983, 1986 and 1989 editions.

Janice A. Beecher, et al. *Instructor's Manual* to accompany Robert L. Lineberry's *Government in America*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1986 edition.

### INSTRUCTIONAL EXPERIENCE

#### Courses

"Introduction to Public Affairs," (Undergraduate, V170). School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University (IUPUI). Fall 1995.

"Public Policy," (Graduate, V512). School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University (IUPUI). Fall 1995.

"Public Policy and Program Implementation" (Graduate, PPM 803). School of Public Policy and Management, Ohio State University. Spring 1992 and Winter 1993.

"Public Policy Formulation and Administration" (Graduate, PPM 801). School of Public Policy and Management, Ohio State University. Fall 1991.

#### Workshops

Regulatory Studies Program for the Louisiana Public Service Commission, Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University. Baton Rouge, Louisiana. February 1996. Lead instructor for water utility regulation seminars.

Advanced Regulatory Studies Program, Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University. East Lansing, Michigan. January 1996. Lead instructor for water utility regulation seminars.

**JANICE A. BEECHER, PH.D.**

---

**Page 11**

Regulatory Studies Program, Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University. East Lansing, Michigan. August 1994 and August 1995. Lead instructor for water utility regulation seminars.

Workshop on the Structure and Regulation of the Water Industry for the Ohio Consumers' Counsel. Columbus, Ohio. January 1996.

Water Policy Forum, NRRRI Biennial Regulatory Information Conference. A series of panels organized and moderated. Columbus, Ohio. September 1992 and September 1994.

### **SPONSORED RESEARCH**

National Regulatory Research Institute. For a descriptive analysis and annotated bibliography on water system regionalization. December 1995.

Raftelis Environmental Consulting Group. For research assistance related to economic regulation and cost allocation. December 1995.

National Association of Water Companies. For a discussion paper on current issues in the structure and regulation of water utilities. July 1995.

Illinois Department of Transportation. For a survey of eastern state law and policy regarding water resource allocation and management. May 1995.

California Urban Water Conservation Council. For participation in the development of a handbook on conservation rates for water utilities. April 1995.

Raftelis Environmental Consulting Group. For a national survey of water, wastewater, and stormwater utility rates. April 1995.

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency. For participation in a study of the use and effectiveness of grants and loans for wastewater treatment. April 1995.

National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners. For research design and project management in the area of water utility regulation at the National Regulatory Research Institute. November 1988 to April 1995.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. For a study of jurisdictional and regulatory alternatives for water utilities in the state of Washington. March 1994.

American Water Works Research Foundation. For participation in a study of water

JANICE A. BEECHER, PH.D.

Page 12

conservation (subcontractor to principal investigator). April 1993.

Water Industry Technical Action Fund. For a discussion paper on integrated water resource planning. February 1993.

Water Industry Technical Action Fund. For a discussion paper on integrated water resource planning. December 1992.

American Water Works Association. For preparing *Cost Allocation and Rate Design for Water Utilities*. March 1991.

#### APPOINTMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Study Group on Identity. Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, 1995-1996.

Article Review. *American Water Works Association Journal*, 1995; *Water Resources Planning and Management*, 1995.

Project Review Committee, *Rocky Mountain Institute Study of the Future of Municipal Water Services*. Summer 1995.

Project Advisory Committee, *Small System Regionalization Study*. American Water Works Association Research Foundation, 1994-present.

Liaison from the Conservation Committee to the Management Committee. American Water Works Association. March 1995-present.

Rates and Charges Subcommittee of the Financial Management Committee. American Water Works Association, 1994-present.

Water Conservation Committee. American Water Works Association, 1993-present. Appointed in 1995 as the liaison to the AWWA Management Division.

Columbus Water Conservation Advisory Board. Mayor's appointment, 1994-1995.

Staff Subcommittee of the Water Committee. National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, 1989-1995.

State of Ohio Pollution Prevention Development Workgroup. Governor's appointment, 1993-1994.

**JANICE A. BEECHER, PH.D.**

---

**Page 13**

Executive Committee. Applied Section, American Political Science Association, 1987-1989.

Research Advisory Committee. The National Regulatory Research Institute, 1987-1988.

Alliance for Least-Cost Energy Planning. City of Chicago, 1987-1988.

#### **EXPERTISE AND PROFESSIONAL SKILLS**

*Economic and environmental regulation of public utilities.*

*Structure and regulation of the water supply industry.*

*Regulatory theory, processes, and decisionmaking.*

*Institutional, comparative, and intergovernmental policy analysis.*

*Research design, management, and methods.*

*Interdisciplinary approaches and analytical frameworks.*

#### **REFERENCES PROVIDED ON REQUEST**

February 1996

COMMISSION-REGULATED WATER AND WASTEWATER UTILITIES

Utility Ownership	Water Utilities		Wastewater Utilities	
	Number of Commissions	Number of Utilities	Number of Commissions	Number of Utilities
Investor-owned or private	46	4,095	28	1,233
Municipally-owned	11	1,547	6	649
Districts	7	1,300	4	205
Cooperatives	4	1,436	2	50
Homeowners' associations	6	85	1	0
Nonprofits	1	73	1	15
Other	1	1	0	0
Totals	46	8,537	28	2,152

Source: Janice A. Beecher, *1995 Inventory of Commission-Regulated Water and Wastewater Utilities* (Indianapolis, IN: Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, 1995). Includes data for Michigan, which ceased regulating 18 systems in early 1996.

*Indiana University ♦ School of Public & Environmental Affairs* *Center for Urban Policy & the Environment*

Date: January 10, 1996

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

From: Dr. Janice A. Beecher, Director of Regulatory Studies  
 Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, SPEA, Indiana University  
 (317) 261-3047 Office, (317) 261-3050 Fax

**Re: Quick Survey on Single-Tariff Pricing**

Happy New Year! Can you help me by taking a moment to fill out this quick survey and faxing it back as soon as possible? Completing the survey should require only a short amount of time and I will make the results available to everyone.

**Single-tariff pricing** is used to implement a single rate structure for multiple water (or other) utility systems that are owned and operated by a single utility. With single-tariff pricing, all customers of the utility pay the same rate for service, even though the individual systems providing service may vary in terms of the number of customers served, operating characteristics, and stand-alone costs. Water utilities with multiple systems are not necessarily found in every state.

**Please answer the following:**

1. Do any of the water utilities regulated by your commission have multiple water systems (☑)? Yes  No

*If No, the remaining questions are not applicable to your state. Please return the first page of the questionnaire so that your state will be represented in the survey.*

2. If you answered Yes to Question 1, please name the multi-system water utilities, the number of systems they operate, and the approximate number of connections for the smallest and largest system operated by the utility. Use an additional sheet if necessary.

<u>Utility Name</u>	<u>Total Number of Systems</u>	<u>Approximate Number of Connections for the:</u>	
		<u>Smallest System</u>	<u>Largest System</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

3. Has your commission approved single-tariff pricing for any of the utilities named in Question 1 (☑)? Yes  Go to Question 4  
 No  Go to Question 5

Indiana University ♦ School of Public & Environmental Affairs Center for Urban Policy & the Environment

4. If your answer to Question 3 was Yes, please name the utilities and when the tariff was first approved. Use an additional sheet if necessary.

<u>Utility Name</u>	<u>When was the tariff first approved?</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. If your answer to Question 3 was No, please check all of the following that apply (☑):

- Single-tariff pricing has not been an issue.
- Single-tariff pricing has been considered but not specifically approved.
- A proposal for single-tariff pricing has been rejected.
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

6. Has single-tariff pricing been explicitly prohibited in your state by statute (☑)? Yes  No

When was the statute passed? \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe the nature of the prohibition: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Has your commission put any monitoring and/or evaluation systems in place for single-tariff pricing in cases where it has been implemented (☑)? Yes  No

If Yes, please describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. If your commission approved single-tariff pricing, what was the primary reason for the approval? \_\_\_\_\_

9. If your commission rejected single-tariff pricing, what was the primary reason for the rejection? \_\_\_\_\_

10. Please characterize your commission's policy position on single-tariff pricing (☑)?

- Generally accepted
- Generally not accepted
- Decided on a case-by-case basis
- Never considered

11. If single-tariff pricing has been an issue in your state, whether or not it has been implemented, please review the following arguments in favor and against single-tariff pricing and check all that have influenced your commission's deliberations or policies on the issue. Check (☑) all that apply:

**Arguments in Favor of Single-Tariff Pricing**

- ✓  
 Provides incentives for utility regionalization and consolidation  
 Mitigates rate shock to utility customers  
 Promotes universal service for utility customers  
 Promotes ratepayer equity on a regional basis  
 Improves service affordability for customers  
 Addresses small-system viability issues  
 Facilitates compliance with drinking water standards  
 Provides ratemaking treatment that is similar to that for other utilities  
 Lowers administrative costs to the utilities  
 Lowers administrative costs to the commission  
 Promotes regional economic development  
 Encourages further private involvement in the water sector  
 Encourages investment in the water-supply infrastructure  
 Physical interconnection is not considered a prerequisite  
 Overall benefits outweigh overall costs  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Arguments Against Single-Tariff Pricing**

- ✓  
 Conflicts with cost-of-service principles  
 Undermines economic efficiency  
 Provides subsidies to high-cost customers  
 Distorts price signals to customers  
 Discourages efficient water-use and conservation  
 Encourages growth and development in high-cost areas  
 Encourages overinvestment in infrastructure  
 Fails to account for variations in customer contributions  
 Provides unnecessary incentives to utilities  
 Considered inappropriate without physical interconnection  
 Not acceptable to all affected customers  
 Not acceptable to other agencies or governments  
 Justification has not been adequate in a specific case (or cases)  
 Insufficient statutory or regulatory basis or precedents  
 Overall costs outweigh overall benefits  
 Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Please provide any additional comments on another sheet. Thank you again for your assistance. I look forward to working with you in 1996.*

SUMMARY OF STATE COMMISSION POLICIES ON SINGLE-TARIFF PRICING FOR WATER UTILITIES		
Generally Accepted (8)	Connecticut Missouri North Carolina Oregon	Pennsylvania South Carolina Texas Washington
Case-By-Case (15)	<u>Single-Tariff Pricing Has Been Approved (8)</u> Arizona New York Florida Ohio Idaho (not an issue) Virginia Illinois West Virginia  <u>Single-Tariff Pricing Has Not Been Approved (7)</u> California (partial consolidation) Indiana (rejected) Maryland (not an issue) Massachusetts (partial consolidation; case pending) Mississippi (not an issue) New Hampshire (partial consolidation) New Jersey (case pending)	
Generally Not Accepted (1)	Vermont (rejected)	
Never Considered (5)	Iowa Kentucky Louisiana	Maine Wisconsin
Not Applicable (16)	Alabama Alaska Arkansas Colorado Delaware Hawaii Kansas Montana	Nebraska Nevada New Mexico Oklahoma Rhode Island Tennessee Utah Wyoming
No Jurisdiction for Water Utilities (6)	Georgia Michigan Minnesota	North Dakota South Dakota Washington, D.C.

Source: Survey of state public utility commission staff members, January-February 1996.

**Commission Policies on Single-Tariff Pricing for Water Utilities**

State	Multi-System Utilities in the State (Q1)	Number of Multi-System Utilities (Q2)	Commission Approval of Single-Tariff Pricing (Q3)	Number of Utilities with Single Tariff Pricing (Q4)	Reasons for No Single-Tariff Pricing (Q5)	Has Single-Tariff Pricing Been Prohibited by Statute (Q6)	Monitor or Evaluate Single-Tariff Pricing (Q7)	Reason for approval (Q8)	Reason for Rejection (Q9)	Commission Policy (Q10)
Alabama	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alaska	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Arizona	Yes	9	Yes	2	NA	No	No	Viability of systems	NA	Case-by-case
Arkansas	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
California	Yes	3	No (a)	0 (a)	Considered but not approved	No	No	NA	NA	Case-by-case
Colorado	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Connecticut	Yes	12	Yes	10	NA	No	No	Mitigate rate shock	NA	Generally accepted
Delaware (b)	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Florida	Yes	60 to 70	Yes	20	NA	No (c)	No	Affordability; revenue stability; rate normalization for construction projects; simplified bookkeeping; reduced rate case expense.	NA	Case-by-case
Georgia	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ
Hawaii	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Idaho	Yes	1	Yes	1	NA	No	No	Not an issue when proposed	NA	Case-by-case

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

State	Multi-System Utilities in the State (Q1)	Number of Multi-System Utilities (Q2)	Commission Approval of Single-Tariff Pricing (Q3)	Number of Utilities with Single Tariff Pricing (Q4)	Reasons for No Single-Tariff Pricing (Q5)	Has Single-Tariff Pricing Been Prohibited by Statute (Q6)	Monitor or Evaluate Single-Tariff Pricing (Q7)	Reason for approval (Q8)	Reason for Rejection (Q9)	Commission Policy (Q10)
Illinois	Yes	4	Yes	2	NA	No	No	Reasonably consistent costs and source-of-supply	Difference in source-of-supply costs	Case-by-case
Indiana	Yes	2	No	0	Rejected	No	NA	source of supply, cost-based rates	Cost-of-service; cost-based rates	Case-by-case
Iowa	Yes	1	No	0	Not an issue	No	NA	NA	NA	Never considered
Kansas	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kentucky	Yes	1	No	0	Not an issue	No (d)	NA	NA	NA (d)	Never considered
Louisiana	Yes	10	No	0	Not an issue	No	NA	NA	NA	Never considered
Maine	Yes	1	No	0	Not an issue	No	NA	NA	NA	Never considered
Maryland	Yes	2	No	0	Not an issue	No	NA	NA	NA	Case-by-case
Massachusetts	Yes	1	No (a)	0 (a)	Considered but not approved	No	No	Contiguity of communities; commonality of personnel; administrative convenience	Need for further post-merger experience.	Case-by-case
Michigan	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ
Minnesota	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	Not an issue	No	NA	NA	NA	Case-by-case
Mississippi	Yes	1	No	NA	Not an issue	No	NA	NA	NA	Case-by-case
Missouri	Yes	2	Yes	2	NA	No	No	Cost savings	Generally accepted	Generally accepted

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

Commission Policies on Single-Tariff Pricing for Water Utilities

**Commission Policies on Single-Tariff Pricing for Water Utilities**

State	Multi-System Utilities in the State (Q1)	Number of Multi-System Utilities (Q2)	Commission Approval of Single-Tariff Pricing (Q3)	Number of Utilities with Single-Tariff Pricing (Q4)	Reasons for No Single-Tariff Pricing (Q5)	Has Single-Tariff Pricing Been Prohibited by Statute (Q6)	Monitor or Evaluate Single-Tariff Pricing (Q7)	Reason for Approval (Q8)	Reason for Rejection (Q9)	Commission Policy (Q10)
Montana (b)	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nebraska	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nevada	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Hampshire	Yes	4	No (a)	0 (a)	Considered but not approved	No	NA	NA	NA	Case-by-case
New Jersey	Yes	3	No	0	Considered but not approved	No	NA	NA	NA	Case-by-case
New Mexico	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New York	Yes	5	Yes	1	NA	No	Acceptable cost-of-service differentials	Cost-of-service differentials	NA	Case-by-case
North Carolina	Yes	50	Yes	46	NA	No	More economical for utility and customers, less tracking required.	NA	NA	Generally accepted
North Dakota	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ
Ohio	Yes	3	Yes	2	NA	No	Company request, cost savings, customer benefits	NA	NA	Case-by-case
Oklahoma	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oregon	Yes	1	Yes	1	NA	No	Public interest	NA	NA	Generally accepted

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Commission Policies on Single-Tariff Pricing for Water Utilities**

State	Multi-System Utilities in the State (Q1)	Number of Multi-System Utilities (Q2)	Commission Approval of Single-Tariff Pricing (Q3)	Number of Utilities with Single Tariff Pricing (Q4)	Reasons for No Single-Tariff Pricing (Q5)	Has Single-Tariff Pricing Been Prohibited by Statute (Q6)	Monitor or Evaluate Single-Tariff Pricing (Q7)	Reason for approval (Q8)	Reason for Rejection (Q9)	Commission Policy (Q10)
Pennsylvania (e)	Yes	11	Yes	7	NA	No	No	Economies of scale; mitigate rate shock associated with improvements; lessen bookkeeping and reporting.	NA	Generally accepted; case-by-case
Rhode Island	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
South Carolina	Yes	4	Yes	4	NA	No	No	Uniform cost allocation; lower billing costs; base charge covers most fixed costs.	NA	Generally accepted
South Dakota	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ
Tennessee	No	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Texas	Yes	200 to 300	Yes	Most	NA	No	No	Regionalization, lower administrative cost	NA	Generally accepted and preferred
Utah	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vermont	Yes	1	No	NA	Rejected	No	NA	NA	Cross subsidization	Generally not accepted

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Commission Policies on Single-Tariff Pricing for Water Utilities**

State	Multi-System Utilities in the State (Q1)	Number of Multi-System Utilities (Q2)	Commission Approval of Single-Tariff Pricing (Q3)	Number of Utilities with Single Tariff Pricing (Q4)	Reasons for No Single-Tariff Pricing (Q5)	Has Single-Tariff Pricing Been Prohibited by Statute (Q6)	Monitor or Evaluate Single-Tariff Pricing (Q7)	Reason for approval (Q8)	Reason for Rejection (Q9)	Commission Policy (Q10)
Virginia	Yes	4	Yes	4	NA	No	No	Spreads costs; separating small-system costs not always effective.	NA	Case-by-case
Washington	Yes	30	Yes	25	NA	No	No	Economies of scale for small systems	NA	Generally accepted
West Virginia (f)	Yes	26	Yes	17	NA	No	Yes (g)	Promotes regionalization; ratepayer equity; ratemaking treatment similarity (f).	Cost-of-service principles; customer contribution inequities (f).	Case-by-case
Wisconsin (h)	Yes	1	No	0	Not an issue	No	NA	NA	NA	Never considered
Wyoming (b)	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
D.C.	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

J. Beecher

**Commission Policies on Single-Tariff Pricing for Water Utilities**

State (Q1)	Number of Multi-System Utilities (Q2)	Commission Approval of Single-Tariff Pricing (Q3)	Number of Utilities with Single Tariff Pricing (Q4)	Reasons for No Single-Tariff Pricing (Q5)	Has Single-Tariff Pricing Been Prohibited by Statute (Q6)	Monitor or Evaluate Single-Tariff Pricing (Q7)	Reason for approval (Q8)	Reason for Rejection (Q9)	Commission Policy (Q10)

- (a) Partial rate consolidation has been approved; single-tariff pricing may be phased-in for some utilities.
- (b) Response by phone or derived from 1995 *Inventory of Commission-Regulated Water Systems*; no multi-system water utilities.
- (c) Proposed legislation would require physical interconnection of systems for single-tariff pricing.
- (d) Farmers Home Administration debt requirements prohibit, but the issue did not come before the commission.
- (e) May be more multi-system water utilities in the state.
- (f) The commission regulates public service districts. These data reflect primarily the views of staff involved in regulating the districts.
- (g) Reevaluation of rate cases where single-tariff pricing has been implemented (for public service districts).
- (h) Response applies to regulated investor-owned utilities only. The Commission also regulates municipal water utilities and state law requires single-tariff pricing throughout municipalities.

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Commission Policies on Single-Tariff Pricing for Water Utilities**

State	Multi-System Utilities in the State (Q1)	Number of Multi-System Utilities (Q2)	Commission Approval of Single-Tariff Pricing (Q3)	Number of Utilities with Single Tariff Pricing (Q4)	Reasons for No Single-Tariff Pricing (Q5)	Has Single-Tariff Pricing Been Prohibited by Statute (Q6)	Monitor or Evaluate Single-Tariff Pricing (Q7)	Reason for approval (Q8)	Reason for Rejection (Q9)	Commission Policy (Q10)
Yes	29	-	16	-	-	0	1	-	-	-
No	16	-	13	-	-	29	17	-	-	-
NA	0	-	16	-	32	16	27	28	38	16
NJ	6	-	6	-	6	6	6	6	6	6
Not an issue	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
Rejected	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Considered but not approved	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
Generally accepted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
Generally not accepted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Case-by-case	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
Never considered	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>			<b>51</b>

**Summary Data**

Yes	29	-	16	-	-	0	1	-	-	-
No	16	-	13	-	-	29	17	-	-	-
NA	0	-	16	-	32	16	27	28	38	16
NJ	6	-	6	-	6	6	6	6	6	6
Not an issue	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	-	-
Rejected	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Considered but not approved	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
Generally accepted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
Generally not accepted	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Case-by-case	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
Never considered	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>			<b>51</b>

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
Alabama	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Alaska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Arizona	Willhoit Water Company	4	47	140	Yes	1993	
	Water Utility of Greater Tonopah, Inc.	7	4	67	Yes	1994	
	Arizona Water Company	20	176	8,120	No	NA	
	Big Park Water Company	3	10	1,400	No	NA	
	Citizens Utilities Company	5	416	20,000	No	NA	
	Congress Water Company	2	48	434	No	NA	
	Cordes Lakes Water Company	3	600	2,977	No	NA	
Arkansas	Marana Water Service, Inc.	2	88	600	No	NA	
	United Utilities	12	22	1,229	No	NA	
California	Cal Water Service Company	19	485	3,400	Partial	1990s	Phasing-in tariff, subject to cost analysis (a).
Colorado	Southern California Water Company	21	1,000	96,000	Partial	1990s	Phasing-in tariff, subject to cost analysis (a).
	California American Water Company	5	7,000	40,000	No	NA	
Connecticut	Bridgeport Hydraulic Company	7	66	97,000	Yes	1986	
	Connecticut Water Company	16	42	27,000	Yes	1988	
	Connecticut-American Water Company	5	43	16,000	Partial	1985	Phasing-in rate.
	Crystal Water Company	3	480	2,204	Yes	1985	
	Eastern Connecticut Regional Water Co.	25	<5	249	Partial	1993	Six tariffs, phasing-in rate.

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
Florida (b)	Gallup Water Service Company	4	36	574	No	NA	
	Jewett City Water Company	4	20	1,331	Yes	1986	
	Olmstead Water Company	4	31	121	Yes	1995	
	Rural Water Company	20	2	244	Yes	1973	
	Topstone Hydraulic Company	3	41	237	Yes	1975	
	Tyler Lake Water Company	4	27	90	No	NA	
	Unified Water Connections, Inc.	4	136	2,919	Yes	1983	
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Arredondo Utility Company	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Single-tariff for water only.
	Clay Utility Company	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Interconnected water.
Delaware	Consolidated Water Works, Inc.	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Interconnected water.
	Florida Cities Water Company (Lee County)	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Interconnected water.
	Gulf Utility Company	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Noninterconnected wastewater.
	Heartland Utilities, Inc.	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Noninterconnected water.
	Holiday Utility Company, Inc.	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Interconnected wastewater.
	Jacksonville Suburban Utilities Corp., Inc.	21	NR	NR	Partial	NR (b)	Two tariffs.
	Lake Utility Services, Inc.	11	NR	NR	Partial	NR (b)	Two tariffs.
	Lenvil H. Dicks	4	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Noninterconnected water.
	Mad Hatter Utility, Inc.	3	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Interconnected wastewater.
	Marion Utilities, Inc.	23	NR	NR	Partial	NR (b)	Two tariffs.
Marionwood Utilities, Inc.	5	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	Two tariffs.	

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
Georgia	Ocala Oaks Utilities, Inc.	9	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	
Hawaii	Pine Island Utility Corporation	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	
Idaho	Poinciana Utilities, Inc.	4	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	
Illinois	Rainbow Springs Utilities, Inc.	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	
Illinois	Seven Rivers Utilities, Inc.	3	NR	NR	Yes	NR (b)	
Illinois	Sunshine Utilities of Florida Utilities, Inc.	20	NR	NR	Partial	NR (b)	Excludes 2 systems.
Illinois	Hayden Pines Water Company	10	12	646	Yes	1985	Not an issue when proposed.
Illinois	Citizens Utilities Company of Illinois	22	114	8,400	Partial	1965	Some exceptions based on source of supply differences.
Illinois	Illinois-American Water Company	5	1,700	65,200	Partial	1993	Phasing-in one system.
Illinois	Northern Illinois Water Corporation	4	4,000	40,200	No	NA	
Illinois	Consumers Illinois Water Company	8	200	19,200	No	NA	
Indiana	Indiana-American Water Company	16	NR	NR	No	NA	
Indiana	Hoosier Water	4	NR	NR	No	NA	
Iowa	Iowa-American Water Company	2	10,400	43,700	No	NA	
Kansas	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Kentucky	Southeastern W.D. A.T.S.	3	837	1,278	No	NA	
Louisiana	Acadian Water & Sewer	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	
Louisiana	Baton Rouge Water Company	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
	Capital Utilities	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Coast Water System	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Hunstock Hills	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Ascension Water Company	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Louisiana Water Company	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Parish Water Company	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Utilities Data, Inc.	NR	NR	NR	No	NA	
Maine	Consumers Maine Water Company	7	408	7,192	No	NA	
Maryland	Utilities, Inc.	5	75	1,010	No	NA	
	Facilities Services, Inc.	7	31	130	No	NA	
Massachusetts	Massachusetts-American	3	2,400	11,000	Partial	1990	Two tariffs under a settlement agreement; a case is pending (a)
Michigan	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	
Minnesota	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	
Mississippi	Johnson Utility Company	32	12 to 15	600 to 750	No	NA	
Missouri	Missouri-American Water	7	500	2,800	Yes	1995	
	KMB Utilities	6	200	600	Yes	1995	
Montana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Nevada	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
New Hampshire	Consumers New Hampshire Water	24	40	5,000	Partial	NR	Three tariffs; may be moving toward single tariff (a)

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
New Jersey	Pennichuck Water Works	12	35	19,000	No	NA	
	Lakes Regional Water Company	11	30	200	No	NA	
	Carlton Water Company	4	30	175	No	NA	
	New Jersey-American	2	272	329,000	No	NA	A case is pending.
New Mexico	Elizabethtown Water Company	2	10,928	181,100	No	NA	
	Consumers New Jersey	7	422	28,652	No	NA	
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
New York	Jamaica Water Supply	2	30,000	90,000	No	NA	Operated as one system until disconnected and extreme cost differentials became apparent. Smallest serves two industrial customers.
New York	South County Water	4	2	270	No	NA	
	Rand Water	2	148	158	No	NA	
	Northwood Water	2	49	220	No	NA	
North Carolina	Forest Park Water	6	30	60	Yes	1987	Commission imposed single-tariff pricing.
	Alpha Utilities	11	18	121	Yes	1986	
	Bess Brothers	11	16	78	Yes	1971	
	Bogue Banks Water Company	3	80	3,830	Yes	1991	
	Bradshaw Water Company	5	10	41	Yes	1974	
	Brookwood Water Corporation	15	32	5,345	Yes	1974	
	Carolina Water Services of NC	72	13	2,790	Yes	1978	
	Chapel Hill Water	2	24	50	Yes	1991	

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
	Coastal Plains Utility Company	3	36	542	Yes	1967	
	Community Water Works	2	26	51	Yes	1975	
	Corrher Water Service	22	13	193	Yes	1968	
	Crabtree Water Systems	3	10	26	No	NA	
	Cross State Development Company	3	9	140	Yes	1974	
	CWS Systems	16	12	1,211	No	NA	
	D&W Water Systems	2	17	96	Yes	1987	
	Environmental Maintenance	3	20	132	No	NA	
	Fairways Utilities	3	9	296	Yes	1990	
	Fisher Utilities	18	13	184	Yes	1973	
	Fox Run Water Company	6	21	60	Yes	1989	
	Goss Utility Company	7	19	131	Yes	1976	
	Grandfather Golf and Country	2	45	156	Yes	1982	
	Heater Utilities	150	10	2,475	Yes	1972	
	Wayne M. Honeycutt	3	15	40	Yes	1978	
	Huffman Water Systems	10	11	83	Yes	1964	
	Hydraulics, Ltd.	85	4	191	Yes	1966	
	HydroLogic	4	15	64	No	NA	
	Kings Grant Water Company	7	96	850	Yes	1968	
	Knob Creek Utility	3	24	151	Yes	1984	
	Language Water Works Corp.	22	62	678	Yes	1969	
	Ira D. Lee & Assoc.	2	41	145	Yes	1986	
	Lewis Water Company	14	6	80	Yes	1980	

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
	Lincoln Water Works	2	21	122	Yes	1972	
	William K. Mauney	2	19	24	Yes	1976	
	Mercer Environmental	10	47	479	Yes	1965	
	Mid South Water Systems	201	7	429	Yes	1981	
	Giles E. Mullis	2	20	20	Yes	1983	
	Norwood Beach Water System	4	10	36	Yes	1995	
	Piedmont Construction & Water	47	7	147	Yes	1970	
	Prior Construction Company	2	11	184	Yes	1988	
	Quality Water Supplies	14	37	257	Yes	1967	
	Rayco Utilities	10	12	104	Yes	1987	
	Scientific Water & Sewage	5	106	537	Yes	1964	
	Scotland Water	4	39	91	Yes	1983	
	Scotsdale Water & Sewage	15	7	205	Yes	1990	
	Setzer Brothers Well Boring	3	30	72	Yes	1972	
	Spring Water Company	2	17	139	Yes	1977	
	Surry Water Company	30	8	206	Yes	1972	
	Turner Farms	4	20	127	Yes	1982	
	Water Resources	2	9	81	Yes	1993	
	West Wilson Water Company	6	15	74	Yes	1988	
	Woods Water Works	4	5	19	Yes	1981	

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

### Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
North Dakota	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	
Ohio	Ohio-American Water	8 or 9	300	15,000	Yes	1975 to 1983	
	Citizens Utilities	6	278	3,023	Yes	1975 to 1983	
	Consumers Ohio Water	4	7,516	25,254	No	NA	
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Oregon	Avion Water Company, Inc.	4	52	5,750	Yes	Early 1970s	
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania-American Water Company	27	NR	NR	Yes	1970s & 1980s	Interconnected systems (1970s); noncontiguous systems (1980s).
	United Water Pennsylvania, Inc.	22	NR	NR	Partial	1992	Excludes one system.
	Consumers Pennsylvania Water Company	10	NR	NR	Partial	NR	Three rate zones.
	Citizens Utilities Water Company of PA	20	NR	NR	Partial	NR	Five rate zones.
	National Utilities, Inc.	21	NR	NR	Partial	NR	Three rates and four systems with their own tariffs.
	Philadelphia Suburban Water Company	15	NR	NR	Partial	NR	Most acquisitions adopt the single tariff, excludes two systems.
	Newtown Artesian Water Company	2	NR	NR	Yes	1994	Merger of two companies.
	Redstone Water Compnay, Inc.	3	NR	NR	No	NA	Three rate zones and four systems with separate tariffs.
	Frank Sargent	4 to 5	NR	NR	No	NA	May be moving toward single tariff.
	Blaine Rhodes	5	NR	NR	No	NA	May be moving toward single tariff.
	Carl Kreisge	2 to 3	NR	NR	No	NA	May be moving toward single tariff.

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
Rhode Island	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
South Carolina	Carolina Water Service Inc. Heater Utilities, Inc. Blue Ribbon H2O Corporation Upstate Heater Utilities Inc.	53 38 34 21	18 5 5 20	1,500 250 300 50	Yes Yes Yes Yes	1987 1990 1995 1994	
South Dakota	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Texas	Data not easily available						Single-tariff pricing is preferred; a special procedure is used to implement the tariff in conjunction with acquisitions.
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Vermont	Sunshine Water Company	4	12	40	No	NA	
Virginia	Alpha Water Corporation Heritage Homes of Virginia New River Water Company Pocahontas Water Works	28 8 14 2	10 11 7 60	200 29 126 68	Yes Yes Yes Yes	1984 1994 1993 1958	
Washington (c)	Alderton-McMillin Water Supply, Inc. Aquarius Utilities, Inc. Arcadia Utilities Bethel Water Company Evergreen Land & Water, Inc. Gamble Bay Water, Inc.	4 11 3 6 10	NR NR NR NR NR	NR NR NR NR NR	Yes No Yes Yes Yes	NR NA NR NR NR	System under receiptship.

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
	H & R WaterWorks, Inc.	8	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	H2O Company, The	2	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Harbor Water Company, Inc.	79	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Ilial Water Services, Inc.	12	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Lara Lee, Inc.	6	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Mainland View Manor Maintenance Co.	5	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Marvin Road Water Company	4	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Mirromont Services, Inc.	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Monterra, Inc. (Washington Water Systems)	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Northwest Water Systems, Inc.	13	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Pattison Water Company	4	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Point Fosdick Water Company, Inc.	4	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Rainier View Water Company, Inc.	4	NR	NR	Partial	NR	Excludes 1-2 systems.
	Sanderson & Associates, Inc.	13	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Satellite Water Systems	25	NR	NR	No	NA	
	S-K Pump & Drilling	39	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Soren Pedersen Water Company	2	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Sound Water Company, Inc.	4	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	South Bainbridge Water System, Inc.	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	South Sound Utility Company, Inc.	35	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Stroh Water Company	5	NR	NR	Partial	NR	Excludes 1-2 systems.
	Sunshine Acres Water System	4	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
	Thomas Water Services, Inc.	2	NR	NR	Yes	NR	

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

### Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
	Washington Water Supply, Inc.	9	NR	NR	Yes	NR	
West Virginia (d)	West Virginia-American	13	571	68,636	Yes	1982	Formerly 12 to 14 districts.
	Arbuckle	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 8/85	
	Central Hampshire	2	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Friendly	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 4/88	
	Gilmer County	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 12/90	
	Grant County	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 9/83	
	Green Valley-Glenwood	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 6/80	
	Hammond	2	NR	NR	Yes	1982	
	Hardy County	2	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Jefferson County	3	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Kopperston	2	NR	NR	Yes	1981	
	Logan County	5	NR	NR	Yes	1995	
	Mannington	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 3/82	
	Mason County	3	NR	NR	No	NA	
	McDowell County	6	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Oakland	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 5/84	
	Ohio County	3	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 1/81	
	Pendleton County	4	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Preston County #1	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 2/81	
	Preston County #2	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 12/81	
	Raleigh County	3	NR	NR	No	NA	
	Red Sulphur	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 8/83	

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes	
South Putnam	Van	2	NR	NR	No	NA		
Washington Pike	Washington Pike	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 7/80		
Wyoming-Glover	Wyoming-Glover	2	NR	NR	Yes	Prior to 2/85		
Wisconsin Power & Light	Wisconsin Power & Light	2	2,661	13,752	No	NA		
Wisconsin	Several towns with two or three systems	-----Not reported-----						
Wyoming	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Single-tariff pricing is required for municipal utilities.	
D.C.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		

(a) Single-tariff pricing has not been explicitly approved, but some rate consolidation has occurred (three states: four systems). Data were not reported for all multi-system utilities in the state.  
 (b) Only utilities with single-tariff pricing for all or some systems are reported. These rates were approved over time, dating back to at least the early 1980s.  
 (c) Flat rates and metered rates may exist within the same tariff. Similarly, mobile home parks and multi-dwelling units may exist at a separate rate within the same tariff.  
 (d) Only West-Virginia is investor-owned; the rest are public service districts. Only multi-system utilities are reported; interconnected systems and single-systems with multiple tariffs are not included.

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
		1	1	1	128	1	
		1	1	1	20	1	
		1	1	1	65	1	
		1	1	1	213	1	
		2	2	18	1	1	
		201	30,000	329,000	1	1	
		11	751	11,615	1	1	
		4	30	257	1	1	
		203	115	115	1	1	

**Summary Data for All Utilities**

Yes  
 Partial  
 No  
 Total  
 Minimum  
 Maximum  
 Average  
 Median  
 Utilities reported

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**Multi-System Water Utilities and Single-Tariff Pricing**

State	Name of Multi-System Water Utility (Q2)	Approximate Number of Systems (Q2)	Smallest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Largest System (N Connections) (Q2)	Single-Tariff Pricing Approved (Q4)	Approximate Date of Approval (Q4)	Notes
<b>Summary Data for Single-Tariff Utilities</b>							
Yes					128		
Partial					20		
No					0		
Total					148		
Minimum		2	2	18		1958	
Maximum		201	2,400	97,000		1995	
Average		13	123	5,721		1982	
Median		5	20	197		1983	
Utilities reported		148	80	80		79	

**Summary Data for Multi-System Utilities Without Single Tariff**

Yes					0		
Partial					0		
No					65		
Total					0		
Minimum		2	2	26			
Maximum		32	30,000	329,000			
Average		6	2,187	25,088			
Median		4	75	1,229			
Utilities reported		55	35	35			

Notes: For responses reported as a range of values, averages were used (for example, "8 to 9" was averaged to "8.5"). For the response "< 5," a value of 4.5 was used.

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MULTI-SYSTEM UTILITIES  
WITH AND WITHOUT SINGLE-TARIFF PRICING**

Utilities	Number of Utilities Reported		Approximate Number of Systems				Smallest System (# Connections)				Largest System (# Connections)			
	Approx Systems	Number of Connections	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Median
All Utilities	203	115	2	201	11	4	2	30,000	751	30	18	329,000	11,615	257
Single-Tariff Utilities	148	80	2	201	13	5	2	2,400	123	20	18	97,000	5,721	197
Multi-System Utilities Without Single-Tariff Pricing	55	35	2	32	6	4	2	30,000	2,187	75	26	329,000	25,088	1,229

Arguments in Favor of Single-Tariff Pricing (a)

State	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi
Regionalization Incentives	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Mitigates Rate Shock	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Universal Service	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Regional Equity	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	Yes	NI	NI	NI
Service Affordability	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Small-System Viability	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Compliance with Standards	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Similar Ratemaking to Other Utilities	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	Yes	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Lowers Admin. Costs to Utility	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	Yes	NI	NI	NI
Lowers Admin. Costs to Commission	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Regional Economic Development	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Encourages Private Involvement	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Encourages Investment	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Interconnection Not Required	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	Yes	NI	NI	NI
Overall Benefits Outweigh Costs	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	Yes	NI	NI	NI
Other	NA	NA	No	NA	No	NA	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Number of "Yes" Responses	NA	NA	6	NA	4	NA	14	NA	13	NA	NA	NI	8	2	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	3	NI	NI	NI

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NI = No jurisdiction; NI = Not an issue

**Arguments in Favor of Single-Tariff Pricing (a)**

State	Regionalization Incentives	Mitigates Rate Shock	Universal Service	Regional Equity	Service Affordability	Small-System Viability	Compliance with Standards	Similar Rate-making to Other Utilities	Lowers Admin. Costs to Utility	Lowers Admin. Costs to Commission	Regional Economic Development	Encourages Private Involvement	Encourages Investment	Interconnection Not Required	Overall Benefits Outweigh Costs	Other	Number of "Yes" Responses
Missouri	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	NA	7	
Montana	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Nebraska	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Nevada	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	4	
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	8	
New Mexico	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
New York	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes (b)	Yes	3	
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	9	
North Dakota	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	
Ohio	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	6	
Oklahoma	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	12	
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	11	
Rhode Island	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
South Carolina	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	4	
South Dakota	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	NJ	
Tennessee	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Texas	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6	
Utah	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Vermont	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	
Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6	
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	14	
West Virginia	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	6	

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction; NI = Not an issue

**Arguments in Favor of Single-Tariff Pricing (a)**

State	Regionalization Incentives	Mitigates Rate Shock	Universal Service	Regional Equity	Service Affordability	Small-System Viability	Compliance with Standards	Similar Ratemaking to Other Utilities	Lowers Admin. Costs to Utility	Lowers Admin. Costs to Commission	Regional Economic Development	Encourages Private Involvement	Encourages Investment	Interconnection Not Required	Overall Benefits	Outweigh Costs	Other	Number of "Yes" Responses
Wisconsin	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Wyoming	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
D.C.	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Summary Data</b>																		
Yes	15	17	8	6	12	12	9	10	16	8	3	2	5	13	9	9	1	-
No	6	4	13	15	9	9	12	11	5	13	18	19	16	8	12	20	-	-
NI	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	-
NA	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	-
NJ	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	-
Total	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51

(a) These findings reflect staff views about the arguments affecting commission deliberations or policies.  
 (b) Can be consistent with cost-of-service principles.

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction; NI = Not an issue

State	Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi
Conflict with Cost-of-Service	NA	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	Yes	Yes	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	Yes	NI	NI	NI
Undermines Economic Efficiency	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Subsidies to High-Cost Customers	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Distorts Price Signals	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Discourages Efficient Water Use	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Encourages Growth in High-Cost Areas	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Encourages Overinvestment	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Fails to Account for Contributions	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Unnecessary Incentives	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Inappropriate Without Interconnection	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	Yes	NI	NI	NI
Not Acceptable to All Customers	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Not Acceptable to Agencies	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Not Justified in a Specific Case	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	Yes	Yes	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	Yes	NI	NI	NI
Insufficient Precedents	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	No	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Overall Costs Outweigh Benefits	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Other	NA	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA	NI	Yes	No	NI	NA	NI	NI	NI	NI	No	NI	NI	NI
Number of "Yes" Responses	NA	NA	5	NA	7	NA	6	NA	15	NA	NA	NI	3	4	NI	NA	NA	NA	NI	NI	3	NI	NI	NI

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction; NI = Not an issue

Arguments Against Single-Tariff Pricing (a)

State	Missouri	Montana	Nebraska	Nevada	New Hampshire	New Jersey	New Mexico	New York	North Carolina	North Dakota	Ohio	Oklahoma	Oregon	Pennsylvania	Rhode Island	South Carolina	South Dakota	Tennessee	Texas	Utah	Vermont	Virginia	Washington	West Virginia
Conflict with Cost-of-Service	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Undermines Economic Efficiency	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Subsidies to High-Cost Customers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Distorts Price Signals	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Discourages Efficient Water Use	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Encourages Growth in High-Cost Areas	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Encourages Overinvestment	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Fails to Account for Contributions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Unnecessary Incentives	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Inappropriate Without Interconnection	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Not Acceptable to All Customers	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Not Acceptable to Agencies	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Not Justified in a Specific Case	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Insufficient Precedents	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Overall Costs Outweigh Benefits	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Other	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Number of "Yes" Responses	5	5	5	5	9	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction; NI = Not an issue

**Arguments Against Single-Tariff Pricing (a)**

State	Conflict with Cost-of-Service	Undermines Economic Efficiency	Subsidies to High-Cost Customers	Distorts Price Signals	Discourages Efficient Water Use	Encourages Growth in High-Cost Areas	Encourages Overinvestment	Fails to Account for Contributions	Unnecessary Incentives	Inappropriate Without Interconnection	Not Acceptable to All Customers	Not Acceptable to Agencies	Not Justified in a Specific Case	Insufficient Precedents	Overall Costs Outweigh Benefits	Other Responses	Number of "Yes" Responses
Wisconsin	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
Wyoming	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
D.C.	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Summary Data</b>																	
Yes	14	3	12	7	4	4	1	6	2	8	10	2	6	2	2	0	1
No	7	18	9	14	17	17	20	15	19	13	11	19	15	19	19	21	1
NI	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	1
NA	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	1
NJ	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	1
Total	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51

(a) These findings reflect staff views about the arguments affecting commission deliberations or policies.

NA = Not applicable; NR = Not reported; NJ = No jurisdiction; NI = Not an issue