

Terry Jones<ftjones@prodigy.net>

Reply

Reply all

Forward

To:James A. Ball <jimaball@earthlink.net>;water pollution control authority

Tue 11/12/2024 11:16 AM

Ed and Jim,

I read the final report and found it no more satisfying than the draft that we saw before. I guess you have to be an accountant to appreciate all the negative numbers. It seems that they should have been able to see that we didn't buy the mains and don't pay the debt on the mains; that's on taxpayers as a result of bonding. The report would have been a lot more useful to us if it reflected the actual situation.

I am in favor of going to a different rate structure. My utility bills from Venice, FL, are based on "readiness" and "consumption" and it makes perfect sense. That is the equivalent of item 9 on the final page of the report. Item 10 on that same page seems to make sense as well - that we have different rate structures for each meter size.

So how do we proceed from here? I think we could start by taking the water and sewer budgets and having them reproduced in an Excel format so we can easily manipulate them. Then have Mauricio and Tina (for water) and Steve (for sewer) mark each line item as either "fixed" or as a "function of consumption".

To adjust for meter sizes, the items related to meter purchase and testing would be different for each size. (For example, the cost of much more expensive large meters would be shared by fewer users.) Therefore, we would have as many "fixed prices" as there are meter sizes.

The Board would then need to discuss whether all categories of user get the same price for each unit consumed.

Finally, we should discuss how recapitalization is represented in the rate structure. Right now, I would say it belongs in the "fixed" or "readiness" cost.

Your thoughts on how to proceed?

Terry

On Wednesday, November 6, 2024 at 04:27:44 PM EST, water pollution control authority <wpca.ledyard@ledyardct.org> wrote:

For your review...

Ed Lynch, WPCA
Mobile 646-732-9224

□