

STATE	RATE CONSOLIDATION
Alabama	No general policy, but could be permitted for a water company with systems that are close enough to interconnect, and share the same employees and a central office. If the systems are run by different offices, the Commission would likely require stand alone rates.
Alaska	No general policy on this issue, but a municipally owned utility may offer uniform rates to customers receiving the same class of service. AS § 42.05.391(a).
Arizona	Yes although rare. <i>See, e.g., Wilhoit Water Company</i> , Decision No. 58102 (Dec. 9, 1992).
Arkansas	No general policy on this issue, although AC § 23-3-114(b) authorizes the PSC to fix uniform rates throughout a utility's service territory.
California	Yes. <i>See, e.g., California-American Water Company</i> , Decision 06-11-050 (Nov. 30, 2006). The Commission may be adjusting this policy.
Colorado	Yes, although there is a prohibition against any "unreasonable" difference as to rates between localities. § 40-3-106(1)(a), CRS. <i>See, e.g., In the Matter of Advice Letter No. 467 Filed by Atmos Energy Corporation</i> , Docket No. 09AL-507G, Decision No. C06-1235 (Dec. 11, 2009); <i>see Colorado Natural Gas</i> , Docket No. 06S-394G, Decision No. R07-0154 (Feb. 22, 2007) (factors supporting rate consolidation include possibility of future physical connection, absence of a substantial rate disparity, and the potential for efficiencies and associated cost savings from consolidation).
Connecticut	Yes. <i>See, e.g., Ellsworth Water Company</i> , Docket 84-05-06 (Oct 22, 1984).
Delaware	Yes. <i>See, e.g., Artesian Wastewater Management, Inc.</i> , PSC Docket No. 09-116WW, Order No. 7604 (July 7, 2009) (approving uniform tariff, as recommended by Staff, applicable to all of the company's wastewater territories, including future expansions).
District Of Columbia	<i>PRIVATE WATER SYSTEMS NOT REGULATED</i>

Florida	Yes. <i>E.g., Application for Rate Increase in Marion, Orange, Pasco, Pinellas, and Seminole Counties by Utilities, Inc. of Florida</i> , Docket No. 020071-WS, Order No. PSC-03-1440-FOF-WS (Dec. 22, 2003); <i>but see In re: Application for increase in water and wastewater rates by Aqua Utilities Florida, Inc.</i> , Docket No. 080121-WS, Order No. PSC-09-0385-FOF-WS (May 29, 2009) (rejecting standalone rates, as well as fully consolidated rates, in favor of a capband methodology).
Georgia	<i>PRIVATE WATER SYSTEMS NOT REGULATED</i>
Hawaii	No general policy on this issue.
Idaho	Yes. United Water Idaho has been allowed to consolidate rates.
Illinois	Yes. <i>See, e.g., Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS Proposed General Increase in Gas Delivery Service Rates</i> , Docket No. 07-0589 (Sept. 24, 2008) (allowing consolidation of purchased gas cost adjustment rates); <i>Illinois-American Water Company Proposed General Increase in Water and Sewer Rates</i> , Docket No. 07-0507 (July 30, 2008); <i>Illinois-American Water Company Proposed General Increase in Water and Sewer Rates</i> , Docket No. 02-0690 (Aug. 12, 2003); <i>Illinois-American Water Company Proposed General Increase in Water Rates</i> , Docket No. 00-0340 (Feb. 15, 2001).
Indiana	Yes, on a case-by-case basis. <i>See Petition of Indiana-American Water Co.</i> , Cause No. 42520 (Nov. 18, 2004). Also, when a utility has severe deficiencies and the URC provides for its acquisition by another utility, the URC has the power to permit cost recovery mechanisms including a plan for equalizing rates of the deficient utility with those of the acquiring utility. Ind. Code § 8-1-30-5(e)(4).
Iowa	No general policy on this issue, although the Board has begun moving cautiously in this direction. <i>See, e.g., In re Iowa-American Water Company</i> , Docket No. RPU-2009-0004 (Oct. 8, 2009) (implementing equalization of general metered service but postponing equalization for private fire service).
Kansas	Yes, <i>see</i> KSA §§ 6-117 (allowing joint rates), 66-128 (same), although this issue has not been addressed in the water context. <i>See In the Matter of the Investigation of Westar Energy Inc., and Kansas Gas and Electric Company to Consider the Issue of Rate Consolidation and Resulting Rate Design</i> , Docket No. 09-WSEE-641-GIE (Oct. 26, 2009).

Kentucky	Determined on a case-by-case basis. The Commission has suggested single tariff pricing is a desirable policy goal, and approved it in connection with the settlement of Kentucky-American Water Company's 2007 rate proceeding. <i>Adjustment of the Rates of Kentucky-American Water Company</i> , Case No. 2007-00143 (Nov. 29, 2007).
Louisiana	Yes. <i>See, e.g., Total Env'tl. Solutions, Inc.</i> , La. PSC Order No. U-22148 (Subdocket H) (Dec. 17, 2003); <i>Total Env'tl. Solutions, Inc.</i> , La. PSC Order No. U-22148 (Subdocket A) (Sept. 7, 2000).
Maine	No general policy on this issue, but the governing body of a municipal or quasi-municipal utility shall establish and file rates which are uniform within the territory supplied when the cost of service is substantially uniform. MRS § 6105(3).
Maryland	No general policy on this issue. However, in <i>Merger of Baltimore Gas and Electric Company and Potomac Electric Power Company</i> , 176 PUR4th 316, 88 Md.PSC 47 (1997), the Commission approved the joint applicants' proposal to unify their fuel rate, as an initial step toward full rate consolidation.
Massachusetts	Yes. <i>See Massachusetts American Water Company</i> , DPU 95-118 (1996), <i>reaffirmed in Aquarian Water</i> , DPU 08-27 (2009).
Michigan	<i>PRIVATE WATER SYSTEMS NOT REGULATED</i>
Minnesota	<i>PRIVATE WATER SYSTEMS NOT REGULATED</i>
Mississippi	No general policy, since utility requests for single tariff pricing are not common. The PSC may permit single tariff pricing, but not in certain circumstances, such as when there is a large capital improvement to one system.
Missouri	Yes. <i>See, e.g., In the Matter of Tariff Filing of Algonquin Water Resources of Missouri, LLC, to Implement A General Rate Increase for Water and Sewer Service Customers</i> , Case No. WR-2006-0425 (Report and Order issued Mar. 13, 2007); <i>In the Matter of Atmos Energy Corporation's Tariff Revision Designed to Consolidate Rates</i> , Case No. GR-2006-0387 (Report and Order issued Feb. 22, 2007).

Montana	Yes. <i>See, e.g., In the Matter of Mountain Water Company</i> , Docket No. D2002.5.60, Order No. 6423b (Dec. 31, 2002) (approving stipulation to implement a single unified rate structure).
Nebraska	No general policy on this issue, although the PSC has approved the merger of all a natural gas utility's rate areas into a single statewide rate area with uniform rates. <i>Re Kinder Morgan, Inc.</i> , App. No. NG-0036 (Dec. 27, 2006).
Nevada	No general policy on this issue.
New Hampshire	Yes, when reasonable. <i>See, e.g., Hampstead Area Water Company</i> , Docket No. DW 05-112, 05-177, Order No. 24,626 (May 26, 2006); <i>Re Lakes Region Water Company</i> , 192 PUR4th 168 (1999); <i>Order Approving Settlement Agreement and Petition for Rate Consolidation, Pennichuck Water Works, Inc.</i> , DR 97-058, Order No. 22,883 (Mar. 25, 1988) (citing RSA 374:2 and RSA 378:28, which generally require just and reasonable rates).
New Jersey	Yes. <i>See, e.g., In the Matter of the Petition of Consumers New Jersey Water Company</i> , Docket No. WE02060373 (Jan. 13, 2003); <i>see also In the Matter of the Petition of New Jersey American Water Company, Inc.</i> , BPU Docket No. WR08010020 (Dec. 8, 2008) (declining to approve unified statewide rates, but directing the utility to perform a Statewide Demographics Study to determine whether it is appropriate to implement statewide rates within its service territory).
New Mexico	Yes. <i>In the Matter of Southwestern Public Service Company</i> . (N.M. PRC Order entered August 26, 2008).
New York	Yes, the Commission has permitted gradual movement toward single tariff pricing. <i>See, e.g., Aqua New York, Inc.</i> , Case 08-W-0107 (Order issued Dec. 23, 2008); <i>South County Water Corporation for Water Service</i> , Case 97-W-0667 (Opinion and Order issued Feb. 25, 1998).
North Carolina	Yes. Determined on a case-by-case basis. <i>See, e.g., In the Matter of Application by Carolina Water Service, Inc., of North Carolina, 2335 Sanders Road, Northbrook, Illinois 60062, for Authority to Increase Rates for Water and Sewer Utility Service in All of Its Service Areas in North Carolina</i> , Docket No. W-354, Sub 314 (Jan. 9, 2009) (requiring water and wastewater company to charge separate system-specific water and sewer rates for 4 systems experiencing water quality issues which might be sold in the future).

North Dakota	<i>PRIVATE WATER SYSTEMS NOT REGULATED</i>
Ohio	Yes. <i>See, e.g., In the Matter of the Application of Suburban Natural Gas Company</i> , Case No. 05-216-GA-GCR (Entry issued Mar. 16, 2005).
Oklahoma	No general policy on this issue.
Oregon	Yes. Determined on a case-by-case basis, although the PUC had a long-standing policy of requiring utilities to provide uniform system-wide rates for basic residential service. <i>See, e.g., Re Avion Water Company, Inc.</i> , Order No. 95-527 (May 31, 1995).
Pennsylvania	Yes. It is Commission policy to apply single tariff pricing to the rates of an acquired system, to the extent it is reasonable, as an acquisition incentive to increase the number of mergers and acquisitions to foster regionalization. 52 Pa. Code § 69.711(a)(6); <i>see, e.g., Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission v. Pennsylvania-American Water Company</i> , Docket No. R-00016339 (January 10, 2002).
Rhode Island	No general policy on this issue, although the PUC has recognized the benefits of rate consolidation. <i>See, e.g., Re Narragansett Bay Water Quality Management District</i> , Docket No. 2216, Order No. 14677 (Mar. 24, 1995).
South Carolina	Yes. <i>See, e.g., Application of Carolina Water Service, Inc. for Adjustment of Rates and Charges for the Provision of Water and Sewer Service</i> , Docket No. 2006-92-WS, Order No. 2008-855 (Dec. 30, 2008).
South Dakota	<i>PRIVATE WATER SYSTEMS NOT REGULATED</i>
Tennessee	No general policy on this issue.
Texas	Yes, provided the systems are substantially similar in terms of facilities, quality of service and cost of service, and the tariff provides for rates that promote water conservation for single-family residences and landscape irrigation. However, consolidation is not permitted for a public utility that provided service in only 24 counties on January 1, 2003. TWC § 13.145; <i>see also</i> TWC § 13.182(c) (in ratemaking, the TCEQ may treat 2 or more municipalities served by a utility as a single class). The TCEQ shall by rule establish a preference that rates under a consolidated tariff be consolidated by region. Regions under consolidated tariffs must be determined on a case-by-case basis. TWC § 13.182(d).

Utah	No general policy on this issue.
Vermont	No general policy on this issue. <i>See, e.g., Re Sunshine Water Company, Inc.</i> , Docket Nos. 5559 and 5572 (Sept. 10, 1992) (denying request to consolidate rates based on significant variance in the systems' conditions, but recognizing that these differences may diminish over time).
Virginia	No general policy on this issue. However, the general goal of the Commission is to have uniform rates for utilities, unless the districts are very different and noncontiguous. <i>Compare Re C&P Suffolk Water Company</i> , Case No. PUE-1998-00331 (Sept. 8, 1999) (authorizing single tariff pricing for systems with similar physical characteristics) with <i>Re Skyline Water Co., Inc.</i> , Case No. PUE-2008-00065 (July 20, 2009) (declining to adopt single tariff pricing). Aqua Virginia has proposed rate consolidation in its rate case pending before the VSCC at Docket No. PUE-2009-00059.
Washington	Yes. <i>See, e.g., Washington Water Service Company</i> , Docket No. UW-020168 (Apr. 10, 2002); <i>Re The Washington Water Power Company</i> , 166 PUR4th 481, Ninth Supplemental Order (Dec. 5, 1995).
West Virginia	Yes. <i>West Virginia Water Company Application for Approval of Increased Rates and Charges and Approval of a Company-wide Single Tariff Pricing Concept</i> , Case No. 81-126-W-42A (May 26, 1982), <i>appeal denied, FMC Corporation and Monsanto Company v. Public Service Commission of West Virginia</i> , 70 ARPSCWV 480 (W. Va. Sept. 21, 1982).
Wisconsin	No general policy on this issue.
Wyoming	No general policy on this issue.