COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:			
APPLICATION OF KEN WATER COMPANY FOI RATES SUPPORTED B' TEST YEAR)))	CASE NO. 2012-00520
	DIRECT TESTIMONY OF N March 26, 2		MARA

	USINESS ADDRESS.	AND B	NAME	STATE YOUR	PLEASE	Q.	1
--	------------------	-------	------	------------	--------	----	---

A. My name is William O'Mara and my business address is Government Center, Department of Finance 200 East Main Street, Lexington, Kentucky 40507.

4

5

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am currently employed as the Commissioner of Finance for the Lexington-Fayette

Urban County Government ("Lexington"), a position I have held since March 7, 2013.

From July 31, 1995 until that time, I was employed as the Director of the Division of

Revenue for Lexington.

10

11

Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?

12 A. No.

13

14

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND.

I graduated with a degree in history from the University of Kentucky in 1975 and a

Master in Business Administration from the University of Kentucky in 1984. Prior to my

employment with Lexington I was employed as the director of Finance, Sports Marketing

Division with Host Communications. Before that I as employed with Jerrico, Inc., a

restaurant company, in various positions in accounting and budgeting.

20

21

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?

22 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide additional information regarding Kentucky-23 American Water Company's ("KAW") decision to end its billing services arrangement 24 with Lexington.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE BILLING SERVICES THAT KAW PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED

TO LEXINGTON.

A. Over a period of time the company eventually provided Lexington with billing services related to Lexington's sanitary sewer fees, landfill user fees, and water quality management fees. These services included billing and collecting these fees on behalf Lexington, and included all of the related services such as customer service and printing and mailing the bills.

Α.

Q. FOR APPROXIMATELY WHAT PERIOD OF TIME DID KAW PROVIDE BILLING

SERVICES TO LEXINGTON?

I am only familiar with the period of time since I started working for Lexington. In 1995, Lexington had an agreement with KAW to provide billing services for sanitary sewer fees. In 1997, a separate agreement was entered into with the company to provide billing services for landfill user fees, and in 2009 a separate agreement was entered into to bill for water quality fees. All of these agreements were eventually terminated by KAW effective August 31, 2012.

Α.

Q. WHEN WAS A DECISION MADE TO END THE BILLING RELATIONSHIP?

On October 3, 2011 Lexington was provided official notification that the company intended to end the 3 billing agreements with Lexington 180 days later, which was the notice of termination period provided in the agreements. KAW ultimately agreed to continue to provide the billing services to Lexington until August 31, 2012 in order for us to find another entity to provide the services.

1		
2		
3	Q.	WAS IT LEXINGTON'S DECISION TO END THE BILLING RELATIONSHIP?
4	A.	No. The decision to discontinue the billing services was solely that of KAW.
5		
6	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE BASIS FOR KAW'S DECISION TO
7		END THIS BILLING RELATIONSHIP?
8	A.	It was my understanding based upon what KAW told me and other Lexington officials of
9		employees that they needed to end the relationship for business reasons and that the
10		same thing was being done throughout the American Water Company system. We were
11		also told that this decision should benefit Lexington, the company, and the citizens of
12		Fayette County by giving us more control over our bills and simplifying KAW's bills.
13		
14	Q.	DID LEXINGTON WANT THE KAW RECONSIDER ITS DECISION TO END THE
15		BILLING SERVICES?
16	A.	Yes, but we were advised by the Company that there was nothing we could do that
17		could make them reconsider their decision.
18		
19	Q.	HOW MUCH WAS LEXINGTON PAYING KAW TO PROVIDE BILLING SERVICES?
20	A.	The average monthly payment to the company for the 3 agreements was \$135,570 for
21		the 12 months immediately preceding the termination of the agreements.
22		
23	Q.	DOES KAW PROVIDE ANY SERVICES TO LEXINGTON AT THIS TIME WHICH

ARE BILLING-RELATED?

A. Yes. Lexington still needs the company to provide it with information related to water usage as Lexington's sanitary sewer fees are based upon water usage. In addition, the company has agreed to provide limited shutoff services in the event that the sanitary sewer fees are not paid.

6 Q. HOW MUCH DOES LEXINGTON PAY FOR THESE SERVICES?

A. Lexington pays the company three cents (\$.03) for each monthly billing record it uses for billing any of its fees and additional amounts in the event that it requests water shut-offs for nonpayment of the sanitary sewer fees. Lexington has been paying the company approximately \$3,300 a month for the billing record information. Lexington has yet to request the shut off of anyone's water service so there have been no costs incurred for those services.

Q. HOW DOES LEXINGTON CURRENTLY HANDLE THE BILLING SERVICES WHICH USED TO BE PROVIDED BY KAW?

16 A. Lexington has a multi-year agreement with Greater Cincinnati Water Works to provide 17 the billing, collection, and customer service functions which used to be provided by 18 KAW. There is a separate contract with another vendor for the printing and mailing 19 expenses associated with the billings.

Q. HOW MUCH DOES LEXINGTON PAY FOR THESE SERVICES?

A. The monthly average to date has been approximately \$124,000 for the services provided by Cincinnati Water. The printing and mailing costs have been in excess of a monthly average of \$52,000.

22

23

IN THIS CASE?

CLAIMING IT SHOULD RECEIVE THROUGH ITS REQUESTED RATE INCREASE

1	A.	No. All of the costs that I have talked about are the additional costs that Lexington wil
2		have to bear as a result of KAW's decision to end the billing relationship. Any increased
3		amount the company is requesting in the case would be additional to these costs.

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH KAW'S ASSERTION THAT THE DECISION TO END

BILLING AND COLLECTION SERVICES WOULD BE OF BENEFIT TO LEXINGTON

AND ITS CITIZENS?

No. I think this decision has not resulted in any benefit to Lexington or its citizens. To the contrary, it has a direct increase in cost to Lexington of at least \$500,000 a year and will likely result in the fees for these services being increased.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

13 A. Yes.