CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Statement 1 was served upon

the persons listed below:

Via Email Only

Sharon Webb, Esq. Office of Small Business Advocate Forum Place Building 555 Walnut Street, 1st Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101 <u>swebb@pa.gov</u>

Patrick Cicero, Esq. Christine Appleby, Esq. Office of Consumer Advocate 555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor, Forum Place Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923 pcicero@paoca.org cappleby@paoca.org

Richard Kanaskie, Esq. Allison C. Kaster, Esq. Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement Commonwealth Keystone Building 400 North St. 2nd Floor West Harrisburg, PA 17120 <u>rkanaskie@pa.gov</u> <u>akaster@pa.gov</u>

John W. Sweet, Esq. Elizabeth R. Marx, Esq. Ria M. Pereira, Esq. The Pennsylvania Utility Law Project 118 Locust St. Harrisburg, PA 17101 pulp@pautilitylawproject.org

Barbara R. Alexander 83 Wedgewood Drive Winthrop, ME 04364 <u>barbalexand@gmail.com</u>

Thomas J. Sniscak, Esq.

Kevin J. McKeon, Esq. Whitney E. Snyder, Esq. Hawke McKeon & Sniscak, LLP 100 North Tenth Street Harrisburg, PA 17101 <u>tjsniscak@hmslegal.com</u> <u>kjmcKeon@hmslegal.com</u> <u>wesnyder@hmslegal.com</u>

John F. Doherty, Esq. Krysia Kubiak, City Solicitor Michael E. Kennedy, Associate City Solicitor Pittsburgh Department of Law City-County Building, Suite 313 414 Grant Street Pittsburgh, PA 15219 John.doherty@pittsburghpa.gov krysia.kubiak@pittsburghpa.gov Michael.kennedy@pittsburghpa.gov

Jared Thompson, Esq. Peter DeMarco, Esq. Natural Resources Defense Council 1152 15th St., NW, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20005 Jared.thompson@nrdc.org pdemarco@nrdc.org

Brian Kalcic Excel Consulting 225 S. Meramec Ave., Suite 720T St. Louis, MO 63105 Excel.consulting@sbcglobal.net

Deanne O'Dell, Esq. Daniel Clearfield, Esq. Karen O. Moury, Esquire Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC 213 Market St., 8th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101 dodell@eckertseamans.com dclearfield@eckertseamans.com kmoury@eckertseamans.com (717) 237 - 6000

Hon. Charles E. Rainey, Jr. Chief Administrative Law Judge Pa. Public Utility Commission 400 North Street Harrisburg, PA 17120 bobbwillia@pa.gov

Cheryl R. McAbee

Dated: August 9, 2023

Cheryl R. McAbee Pa I.D. No. 44344

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission)	Docket Nos.
)	R-2023-3039919 (Stormwater)
)	R-2023-3039920
V.)	R-2023-3039921
Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority)	
·)	
)	
)	
)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ROBERT STRAUSS

River Development Corporation Statement No. 1

Addressing: Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority's proposed tariff increases on

STORMWATER.

August 9, 2023

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ROBERT STRAUSS

1 I. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND ON WHOSE BEHALF YOU ARE TESTIFYING.

A. Dr. Robert P Strauss, Professor of Economics and Public Policy, Heinz College,
Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, and residing at 2307 Country Place
Court, Export, PA, 15632; testifying on behalf of River Development Corporation
("RDC").

8

11

Q.

WHAT ARE YOUR JOB RESPONSIBILITIES.

9 A. I am a tenured full professor of economics at Carnegie Mellon since joining the
10 University in the summer of 1979, and as such:

12 1] train primarily graduate students at the Heinz College in matters of public 13 financial management at the federal, state and local levels; 2] conduct 14 independent research for publication in a variety of forums including peer 15 reviewed journals; 3] on occasion perform independent research studies in areas 16 of my general and specific expertise for permanent government agencies and 17 elected officials; 4] on occasion conduct independent research studies and/or 18 participate in commissions organized for the purpose of improving general and 19 specific financial policies affecting the public and private sectors; 5] testify before 20 federal, state, and local legislative bodies on matters related to public financial 21 management; 6] advise periodically various federal, state, and local revenue and 22 statistical agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service and US Bureau of the

1		Census. [See www.andrew.cmu.edu/user/rs9f] Please note that this testimony
2		reflects my views and not that of Carnegie Mellon University or its Trustees.
3	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR ENERGY AND EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE?
4		I hold an AB with Honors and Distinction in Economics from the University of
5		Michigan, Ann Arbor [1966], and a Phd. in Economics from the University of Wisconsin,
6		Madison [1970] in the fields of public finance and human resources.
7		My experience in the domain of energy began while on the professional staff of the Joint
8		Committee on Taxation, US Congress, where I was assigned and performed the public
9		responsibility for being the chief energy savings estimator for the US House of
10		Representatives and US Senate, and also was primarily responsible for the analysis and
11		legislative drafting of various business and residential tax credits[1976-8], several of
12		which were enacted by the US Congress.
13	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE A PUBLIC
13 14	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE A PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION?
	Q. A.	
14		UTILITY COMMISSION?
14 15	A.	UTILITY COMMISSION? No.
14 15 16	A.	UTILITY COMMISSION? No. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED IN OTHER
14 15 16 17	A. Q.	UTILITY COMMISSION? No. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED IN OTHER PENNSYLVANIA CASES, PARTICULARLY TAX CASES?
14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	UTILITY COMMISSION?No.HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED IN OTHERPENNSYLVANIA CASES, PARTICULARLY TAX CASES?Yes. A list of the cases in which I have previously provided testimony isincluded with my CV at page 7 under Litigation Support, and attached hereto as RDC
14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A.	UTILITY COMMISSION?No.HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED IN OTHERPENNSYLVANIA CASES, PARTICULARLY TAX CASES?Yes. A list of the cases in which I have previously provided testimony isincluded with my CV at page 7 under Litigation Support, and attached hereto as RDC
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Exhib	UTILITY COMMISSION? No. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED IN OTHER PENNSYLVANIA CASES, PARTICULARLY TAX CASES? Yes. A list of the cases in which I have previously provided testimony is included with my CV at page 7 under Litigation Support, and attached hereto as RDC it 6.

1 storm water charge has been authorized as required by law by the duly elected City 2 Council of Pittsburgh predicate to PWSA's submission and consideration of said storm 3 water charges by the PUC, the existing and proposed storm water charges were and are 4 defective, b] that as a consequence of these predicate defects in these storm water 5 charges, they were improperly approved by the Public Utilities Commission e.g. the 6 PUC should never have considered the defective, unapproved request to impose a 7 stormwater charge by the PWSA, c] the defective earlier and proposed storm water 8 charges are unjust because the measure of the stormwater charge is merely based on area 9 of non-permeable surface area and as such is really a property tax rather than a charge 10 related to either the use or responsibility of storm water mitigation services, and, as such, 11 said tax violates the Uniformity Clause of the Pennsylvania Constitution as to what 12 governmental entity may impose a tax in Pennsylvania, d] the imposition of the earlier 13 and proposed storm water charges are unjust and improper because RDC has been and is 14 a customer of Pennsylvania American Water, not PWSA, e.g. RDC erroneously paid a 15 storm water charge to PWSA and is therefore due a refund of all monies so improperly 16 billed per the above and improperly collected, e] the earlier and proposed storm water 17 charge is unjust and unreasonable to the business of RDC because the dollars of monies 18 being billed are an unjust and unreasonable proportion of said business net income.

19 20 Π

<u>WHAT MAKES THE STORMWATER FEE A TAX</u>

21 22

Q. IN YOUR OPINION IS THIS STORMWATER CHARGE A TAX?

A. Yes, the currently imposed stormwater charge has the characteristics of a tax rather than a
 fee or charge, and this conclusion was also reached by the Pa. Commonwealth Court.
 The Commonwealth Court held in an unpublished memorandum that " the Stormwater
 Charge constitutes a "local tax" *Borough West Chester v. Pa. State System of Higher*

1	Education and West Chester University of Pa. of the State System of Higher Education,
2	No. 260 M.D. 2018 (Pa. Cmwlth. Jan. 4, 2023) because it provides general benefits
3	enjoyed by the general public. And, while properly viewed as a tax, the Commonwealth
4	Court held it was not a special assessment because the Borough of West Chester was
5	imposing the tax for an indefinite period whereas special assessments typically are
6	imposed once to pay for a discrete infrastructure improvement.
7	The plain English meaning of a fee or charge is that it is imposed, collected and used for
8	a particular purpose, and is voluntarily reflecting extent of use or responsibility, while a
9	"tax" is involuntary in nature and used for a general purpose. The Commonwealth Court
10	could not find a discrete benefit accruing to a single customer from the use of storm water
11	fees, and thus concluded that the charge was really a tax not a fee per se.
12	The characterization of the fee as more properly a tax has several consequential
13	implications. Under the Pennsylvania Constitution, a tax must be uniform in application
14	which means uniform in rate, and must be imposed through political action and collected
15	by elected officials who represent the geographic and political area which elects them.
16	Specifically, Article VIII, § 1. Uniformity of taxation of the PA Constitution provides:
17	"All taxes shall be uniform, upon the same class of subjects, within the territorial
18	limits of the authority levying the tax, and shall be levied and collected under
19	general laws."
20	This 2023 Commonwealth Court decision is consistent with an earlier decision by the
20	Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas regarding the City of Pittsburgh taxation of
<i>∠</i> 1	Anogheny County Court of Common Fleas regarding the City of Fittsburgh taxation of

22 non-resident professional athletes, National Hockey League Player's Ass'n et al. v. City

1		of Pittsburgh, No. GD-19-015542, Ct. of Common Pleas, Allegheny Cty., Sept. 21, 2022,
2		appeal filed, Oct. 19, 2022.
3		. The City of Pittsburgh levied a fee on activities of non-resident professional athletes, but
4		measured it on professional athletes net income earned at 3% while playing in
5		Pittsburgh. The Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas found the City of Pittsburgh's
6		Non-Resident Sports Facility usage Fee, was actually a tax because it was imposed as 3%
7		on non-resident athletes' personal income earned in Pittsburgh and was non-uniform
8		when compared to the taxation of other non-resident income.
9		Given the determination by the Commonwealth Court in Borough of West Chester that
10		the stormwater fee is in fact a tax, and given that PWSA is not an organized local
11		government in Pennsylvania, but a municipal authority with an appointed, rather than
12		elected governing body, it follows that PWSA is without the constitutional or statutory
13		power to impose and collect said tax on RDC.
14	III.	PWSA IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT A STORMWATER FEE?
15	Q.	HAS THE APPLICATION OF A STORMWATER FEE BY PWSA BEEN
16		PROPERLY AUTHORIZED AS REQUIRED BY PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC
17		UTILITY LAW?
18	А.	No. Effective September of 2013, under <u>Act 68, title 53, § 5607 (a)(18)</u> states:
19		Storm water planning, management and implementation as defined in the
20		articles of incorporation by the governing body. Authorities, existing as
21		of the effective date of this paragraph, already operating storm water
22		controls as part of a combined sewer system, sanitary sewer system or
23		flood control project may continue to operate those projects.

1		Thus, any municipal public authority in operation before the above cited section 18,
2		enacted in 2013, such as PWSA, was required to amend its Articles of Incorporation
3		through an adopted resolution by the municipality incorporating the public authority as a
4		predicate for the municipal public authority, such as PWSA, to levy such a new, storm
5		water charge to finance new, storm water services. This authorization to impose a storm
6		water fee has not been done by the Pittsburgh City Council which means that any attempt
7		to collect monies for a storm water charge are without proper, legal authorization.
8		Further, new or proposed storm water <i>projects</i> by any municipal public authority must
9		be approved by ordinance or resolution of said municipality which incorporated the
10		municipal public authority, also as provided in Act 68, Title 53, Para 5607 as follows:
11		(c) Effect of specificity The municipality or municipalities organizing
12		such an authority may, in the resolution or ordinance signifying their
13		intention so to do or from time to time by subsequent resolution or
14		ordinance, specify the project or projects to be undertaken by the
15		authority, and no other projects shall be undertaken by the authority than
16		those so specified. If the municipal authorities organizing an authority
17		fail to specify the project or projects to be undertaken, then the authority
18		shall be deemed to have all the powers granted by this chapter.
19		Given that the Pittsburgh City Council has not authorized such storm water projects,
20		PWSA expenditures of monies collected from improperly collected storm water fees for
21		storm water facilities is improper and without legal authorization.
22	Q.	DID THE PUC IN 2021 ERR IN APPROVING PWSAs RATE SCHEDULE FOR
23 24 25		STORMWATER FEES?
25 26	А.	Yes, because PWSA never received the authority to impose the storm water fee by the

1	Pittsburgh City Council. In 2013, under Act 68 the General Assembly passed and
2	Governor Tom Corbett approved that a new category of services and fees be allowed by
3	any municipal public authority to provide storm water infrastructure, once the public
4	authority's articles of incorporation were amended by the municipal legislature (City of
5	Pittsburgh City Council in the case of PWSA). The only amendment made to the PWSA
6	Articles of Incorporation by Pittsburgh City Council since 1945 was to extend the
7	expiration date of the PWSA to 2045. Thus, PWSA has been charging stormwater fees that
8	were erroneously approved by the PUC. The required procedure for a municipal authority's
9	Articles of Incorporation are shown below:
10	5605 <u>Amendment of articles.</u>
11	(a) <u>Purpose.</u> An authority may amend its articles for the following reasons:
12	(1) To adopt a new name.
13	(2) To modify or add a provision to increase its term of existence to a date not
14	exceeding 50 years from the date of approval of the articles of amendment.
15	(3) To change, add to or diminish its powers or purposes or to set forth different
16	or additional powers or purposes.
17	(4) To increase or decrease the number of members of the board of the authority,
18	to reapportion the representation on the board of the authority and to revise the
19	terms of office of members, all in a manner consistent with the provisions of
20	section 5610 (relating to governing body).
21	(b) <u>Procedure</u> Every amendment to the articles shall first be proposed by the
22	board by the adoption of a resolution setting forth the proposed amendment and
23	directing that it be submitted to the governing authorities of the municipality or
24	municipalities composing the authority. The resolution shall contain the language

1	of the proposed amendment to the articles by providing that the articles shall be
2	amended so as to read as set forth in full in the resolution, that any provision of
3	the articles be amended so as to read as set forth in full in the resolution or that the
4	matter stated in the resolution be added to or stricken from the articles. After the
5	amendments have been submitted to the municipality or municipalities, such
6	municipality or municipalities shall adopt or reject such amendment by resolution
7	or ordinance.
8	(c) Execution and verificationAfter an amendment has been adopted by the
9	municipality or municipalities, articles of amendment shall be executed under the
10	seal of the authority and verified by two duly authorized officers of the corporation
11	and shall set forth:
12	(1) The name and location of the registered office of the authority.
13	(2) The act under which the authority was formed and the date when the original
14	articles were approved and filed.
15	(3) The resolution or ordinance of the municipality or municipalities adopting the
16	amendment.
17	(4) The amendment adopted by the municipality or municipalities which shall be set
18	forth in full.
19	(d) <u>Advertisement</u> The authority shall advertise its intention to file articles of
20	amendment with the Secretary of the Commonwealth as provided under section
21	5603 (relating to method of incorporation) for forming an authority.
22	Advertisements shall appear at least three days prior to the day upon which the
23	articles of amendment are presented to the Secretary of the Commonwealth and
24	shall set forth briefly:

1		(1) The name and location of the registered office of the authority.
2		(2) A statement that the articles of amendment are to be filed under the provisions
3		of this chapter.
4		(3) The nature and character of the proposed amendment.
5		(4) The time when the articles of amendment will be filed with the Secretary of the
6		Commonwealth.
7		(e) <u>Filing the amendment</u> The articles of amendment and proof of the required
8		advertisement shall be delivered by the authority or its representative to the
9		Secretary of the Commonwealth. If the Secretary of the Commonwealth finds that
10		the articles conform to law, he shall forthwith, but not prior to the day specified in
11		the advertisement required in subsection (d), endorse his approval of it and, when
12		all fees and charges have been paid, shall file the articles and issue to the authority
13		or its representative a certificate of amendment to which shall be attached a copy of
14		the approved articles.
15	IV.	WILL THE STORMWATER FEE PUT RIVER DEVELOPMENT
16		CORPORATION OUT OF BUSINESS?
17	Q.	FROM AN ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE DO YOU BELIEVE A
18		SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS CAN SURVIVE WITH PWSAs
19		CONTINUAL LONG TERM RATE INCREASES AS SHOWN IN TABLE 2
20		WITH A TAXABLE INCOME ACCORDING TO ITS 2021 TAX
21		RETURN OF \$84,000 (\$7,000/Month)?
22		

Table 2: River Development Stormwater Rate Increases

Year	ERU	Price per ERU for Nonresidential	Amount Paid Per Month	% increase Per year
2022	123	\$5.96	\$733.08	
2023	123	\$7.95	\$977.85	33.4%
2024	123	\$10.26	\$1261.98	29.1%
2025	123	\$12.14	\$1493.22	18.3%
2026	123	\$14.20	\$1746.6	17.0%

2	А.	No. In 2022, per the Table 2 above, the monthly stormwater fee was about 10% of net
3		income, or higher than Pennsylvania's corporate net income tax rate of 9.99%, and by
4		2026 this will rise to 24.9% of net income which will be on top of a variety of federal
5		corporate net income taxes, state net income taxes, sales and use and local real estate
6		taxes.
7	Q.	IS BASING THE STORMWATER CHARGE ON AMOUNT OF
8 9		HARD OR IMPERVIOUS SERVICE A PROPER METHOD OF
9 10 11		MEASUREMENT?
12	А.	No. The surface area of parking and roofs, which is the operational measure of
13		responsibility, is not reasonably related to specific or general benefits of stormwater
14		mitigation for several common sense reasons. FIRST, the use of fees for storm water
15		runoff should be related to what is being mitigated, namely the volume of storm water
16		runoff. The area of non-permeable surfaces is not reasonably related to the amount of
17		storm-water run off for several reasons. SECOND, accumulation of roof water is

1	typically utilized in commercial properties to assist in cooling in the summer, and
2	retaining heat in the winter. The roof of the RDC property in question is horizontal in
3	design and use for that purpose. Excess water runoff from the roof has already been
4	planned and responsibly installed, and PWSA is NOT the vendor providing service in this
5	sense since the building was acquired 27 years ago. The property is a customer and
6	obtains all of its water services from Pennsylvania American Water, not PWSA.
7	Third, according to 2020 calendar year, publicly available data on precipitation reported
8	by the National Oceanic and Atmosphere Administration of the US Government, the
9	annual precipitation in Pittsburgh zip code 15217 was 1032 inches, while in Pittsburgh
10	zip code 15214 the annual participation was 1145 inches, or a 7.7% difference. In 2019
11	the annual precipitation in Pittsburgh zip code 15214 was 1409 inches. Such wide
12	variations in precipitation among and within Pittsburgh zip codes must imply wide
13	differences in resulting storm-water runoff; however, the existing and proposed storm
14	water charge schedules being promulgated by PWSA, even if they were to legally apply
15	generally, or in particular to said property, are hardly just or equitable in view of this
16	extant variability. It should also be pointed out that another key feature of storm water
17	runoff entails the extent to which the non-permeable terrain enables evaporation, which
18	is benign, as contrasted with run off which is obviously impacted by the nature and
19	severity of slope of any terrain. Obviously, simply measuring a spatial area without
20	regard to water run off caused by slope of terrain will lead to inaccurate designation of
21	responsibility or use for storm water runoff.
$\gamma\gamma$	

By: Cheryl R. McAbee

River Development Corporation By Cheryl R. McAbee

VERIFICATION

I, Robert P. Strauss, hereby verifies that the facts set forth in the foregoing Direct Testimony

are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that the statements made herein are subject to 18 Pa. C.S.Section 4904, relating to unsworn falsification to authorities, which provides for criminal penalties if a person with intent to mislead makes a written false statement which they do not believe to be true.

Fibrent P. Shanes

Date: August 9, 2023

Robert P Strauss