Exhibit No.: Issues:

Labor Related Costs, Overtime, Annual Incentive Compensation Costs, External Affairs and Business Development, Other Post-Retirement Benefit Costs, AWR Revenues, Rate Case Expense, Cedar Hill Wastewater Plant, Comprehensive Planning Study, Allocation of Belleville Lab Costs, Security Costs-AAO, Security Costs-Deferred Taxes, St. Joseph Economic Development Rates, MSD Contract, Tank Painting Maintenance Tracker Dennis R. Williams Witness: Exhibit Type: Rebuttal Sponsoring Party: Missouri-American Water Company Case No.: WR-2010-0131 SR-2010-0135 Date: April 15, 2010

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO. WR-2010-0131 CASE NO. SR-2010-0135

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

DENNIS R. WILLIAMS

ON BEHALF OF

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

IN THE MATTER OF MISSOURI-AMERICAN) WATER COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO) FILE TARIFFS REFLECTING INCREASED) CASE NO. WR-2010-0131 RATES FOR WATER AND SEWER) CASE NO. SR-2010-0135 SERVICE)

AFFIDAVIT OF DENNIS R. WILLIAMS

Dennis R. Williams, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the witness who sponsors the accompanying testimony entitled "Rebuttal Testimony of Dennis R. Williams"; that said testimony and schedules were prepared by him and/or under his direction and supervision; that if inquires were made as to the facts in said testimony and schedules, he would respond as therein set forth; and that the aforesaid testimony and schedules are true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

Dennis R. Williams

State of Missouri **County of St. Louis** SUBSCRIBED and sworn to Before me this <u>//// day of</u>_ 2010.

Notary Public

My commission expires:



REBUTTAL TESTIMONY DENNIS R. WILLIAMS MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY CASE NO. WR-2010-0131 SR-2010-0135

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Witness Introduction and Purpose	.1
1.	Labor Related Costs	.2
2.	Overtime	.3
3.	Annual Incentive Compensation Costs	.7
4.	External Affairs and Business Development	.11
5.	Other Post-Retirement Benefit Costs	.20
6.	AWR Revenues	.21
7.	Rate Case Expense	.26
8.	Cedar Hill Wastewater Plant	.33
9.	Comprehensive Planning Study	.34
10.	Allocation of Belleville Lab Costs	.36
11.	Security Costs - AAO	.40
12.	Security Costs – Deferred Taxes	.41
13.	St. Joseph Economic Development Rates	.43
14.	MSD Contract	.46
15.	Tank Painting Maintenance Tracker	.48

1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		
3		DENNIS R. WILLIAMS
4		
5		WITNESS INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE
6		
7	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
8	Α.	My name is Dennis R. Williams, and my title is Senior Manager - Rates and
9		Regulation for the Western District of American Water Works. My business
10		address is 727 Craig Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63141.
11		
12	Q.	HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
13	Α.	Yes, I have submitted direct testimony in this proceeding on behalf of Missouri-
14		American Water Company ("MAWC" or "Company").
15		
16	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
17	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to the Staff Report and/or the
18		direct testimony of OPC and Interveners on the following issues:
19		1) Labor Related Costs;
20		2) Overtime;
21		3) Annual Incentive Compensation Costs;
22		4) External Affairs and Business Development:;
23		5) Other Post-Retirement Benefit Costs;
24		6) AWR Revenues;
25		7) Rate Case Expense;
26		8) Cedar Hill Wastewater Plant;
27		9) Comprehensive Planning Study;
28		10) Allocation of Belleville Lab Costs;
29		11) Security Costs – AAO;

r,

1		12) Security Costs – Deterred Taxes;
2		13) St. Joseph Economic Development Rates;
3		14) MSD Contract; and,
4		15) Tank Painting Maintenance Tracker.
5		9
6		1) LABOR RELATED COSTS
7		
8	Q.	WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST BETWEEN THE COMPANY AND STAFF IN
9		REGARD TO THE ANNUALIZED LEVEL OF PAYROLL?
10	Α.	The approximate dollar values of the differences are as follows:

Issue	Value
1. Estimated Overtime Hours	\$1,400,000
2. Annual Incentive Compensation	335,000
3. External Affairs and Business Development	105,000
4. Number of Employees	1,140,000
5. Wage Rates	720,000
Total	\$3,700,000

12

13 Q. WHAT WAS MAWC'S GENERAL APPROACH TO ANNUALIZATION AND

14 NORMALIZATION OF THE TEST YEAR PAYROLL?

15 A. The Company's filing was based upon a test year ended June 30, 2009. In order to

annualize and normalize the test year payroll levels, the Company began with the

17 most current payroll period at that time and updated for the number of positions and

18 wage rates the Company anticipated would be in effect at the end of the true-up

- 19 period (April 30, 2010). In addition, because capitalization ratios and overtime hours
- 20 can vary from year to year, a three year average was used to normalize those items.
- 21 Finally, the Company made an additional adjustment to the capitalization ratio to
- 22 reflect the permanent transfer of eight employees from construction to maintenance

23 positions.

2 Q. HOW WAS THE COMPANY'S APPROACH DIFFERENT THAN THAT OF THE 3 PSC STAFF?

The two approaches were very similar. Staff began with the most current payroll 4 Α. period that was available at the beginning of its audit. However, Staff made no 5 adjustment for wage rates or employee levels that would exist at the true-up date. 6 This is simply a matter of timing and the differences between the Staff and Company 7 positions for items 3 and 4 in the table above should be eliminated when these items 8 9 are adjusted in the true-up process. Staff also utilized three year averages to normalize capitalization ratios and overtime. Finally, Staff made two additional 10 adjustments - one to eliminate a sizeable portion of incentive payments made to 11 employees and another to eliminate payroll Staff considered to be related to lobbying 12 13 or nonregulated activities. 14 2) OVERTIME 15 16 IF THE STAFF AND COMPANY BOTH USED A THREE YEAR AVERAGE TO 17 Q. DETERMINE NORMALIZED OVERTIME LEVELS, WHY IS THERE AN 18 **APPROXIMATE \$1.4 MILLION DIFFERENCE IN ADJUSTED PAYROLL** 19 **BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES?** 20 The disparity is attributed to the difference in the three-year period selected. The Α. 21 Company used a weighted average of the three, twelve month periods ended June 22 30, 2007, 2008 and 2009 to determine a percentage of overtime to be applied to pro 23 forma base payroll rates. The calculation resulted in a 13.82 percent overtime rate. 24 This was a slightly lower rate than would have resulted had a simple average of 25

3

1		those three years been used. The Staff used a simple three year average of the
2		calendar years 2006, 2007 and 2009, but excluded the year 2008. Both the
3		Company and Staff calculations were made on a district by district basis.
4		
5	Q.	WHY DID THE STAFF EXCLUDE THE YEAR 2008 FROM ITS THREE YEAR
6		CALCULATION?
7	A.	Staff indicated that 2006 was substituted for 2008 in the three-year average
8		calculation because overtime in 2008 was "abnormally high."
9		
10	Q.	WAS 2008 OVERTIME ABNORMALLY HIGH?
11	A.	No. Overtime hours in 2008 were lower than those in calendar year 2007 and
12		roughly equivalent to those in 2006. I believe the Staff came to its conclusion
13		because the data Staff used from year to year was inconsistent.
14		
15	Q.	HOW WAS IT INCONSISTENT?
16	A.	Staff's adjustment was made by computing an average test year wage rate and
17		applying that rate to the simple average of total overtime hours for 2009, plus
18		overtime hours charged to maintenance expense only for the years 2006 and 2007,
19		and then multiplying the result by an expense to capitalization ratio. The use of total
20		overtime hours in 2009 and only overtime hours charged to expense for the other two
21		years is inconsistent.
22		
23		Moreover, when the starting point was already using only those overtime hours
24		charged to expense, it was not appropriate to further reduce the adjustment by
25		applying an expense factor. Doing so, substantially understates overtime labor

- charged to expense. I believe it is likely that this was simply an error and that Staff
 intended to utilize total overtime hours for all years in their selection.
- 3

4Q.OTHER THAN WHAT YOU BELIEVE TO BE AN ERROR IN THE SOURCE5NUMBERS, IS THERE ANY OTHER PROBLEM WITH THE STAFF

- 6 CALCULATION?
- 7 A. Yes. The purpose of this adjustment is to normalize the level of overtime expense.
- 8 The Company accomplished this by determining an average ratio of expensed
- 9 overtime to total labor and applied that ratio to normalized base wages. Staff
- 10 attempted to develop a test year wage rate to apply to average overtime hours. Had
- 11 the Staff used the correct three year period and the correct number of overtime
- 12 hours, Staff's adjustment would still have been understated because it used test year
- 13 wage rates. Normalized wage rates should have been used instead.
- 14

15 Q. IS IT SURPRISING THAT THERE IS VARIANCE FROM YEAR TO YEAR IN THE

- 16 **OVERTIME PERCENTAGE?**
- A. No. That is the primary reason why it is appropriate to use a three-year average in
 order to normalize annual overtime by levelizing the variances.
- 19

20 Q. WHY DO OVERTIME HOURS DIFFER FROM YEAR TO YEAR?

A. There are many different reasons, but one of the primary drivers of overtime hours is repair of main breaks. Main breaks are unpredictable, vary widely from year to year, can occur at any time of day or night, and are largely dependent upon the weather and soil conditions. In 2009, for example, the Company experienced an unusually low number of main breaks and the resulting number of overtime hours to repair

those breaks was, as a result, lower than normal. It appears that Staff failed to
 recognize this fact, and instead incorrectly concluded that 2008 overtime hours were
 abnormally high. However, that should have been no reason to exclude the actual
 overtime costs incurred in 2008 from the normalized levels.

5

6 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

7 There are two reasons typically given for averaging costs from several years Α. 8 experience for variable expense items, rather than simply using test year levels in 9 setting rates. The first argument is that if the test year alone is utilized, the Company is given a perverse incentive to increase those variable costs during the test year so 10 11 as to maximize rate recovery. The second argument is that utilizing an average 12 smooths the variances that exist from year to year so as to build into rates a more normalized level of expense. Staff's arbitrary exclusion of 2008 overtime hours from 13 14 the determination of what is average, simply because this amount was believed to 15 be higher than normal, appears to be designed solely to reduce the calculated revenue requirement in this case. The fact is that 2009 overtime hours were lower 16 17 than normal, far more so than were 2008 overtime hours abnormally high; yet, Staff 18 did not exclude those hours from the average calculation.

19

20 Q. WHAT KIND OF ANALYSIS HAVE YOU PREPARED TO SUPPORT THAT

21 STATEMENT?

A. I reviewed actual overtime hours over the past ten years. That information is
 summarized on Schedule DRW – 1. Overtime hours for calendar year 2009 were by
 far the lowest of any other year during that ten-year period. However, during that
 same ten-year period, there were three other years in which the 2008 expensed

MAWC - DRW Rebuttal

overtime hour levels were exceeded.

2

In fact, 2009 overtime maintenance hours were so low that they approximated total overtime hours from 2006 and 2007. That may well have been a reason for Staff's exclusion of 2008 overtime labor hours as being too high. It is possible the Staff mistook the total 2009 labor hours as being equivalent to 2006 and 2007 because they were comparing to expensed hours only in the earlier two years. Clearly, it is the year 2009 that is abnormal – not 2008.

9

10 Q. WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS FACT?

A. If Staff is consistent in its logic, that the traditional averaging of historical information
 should be adjusted to exclude outliers; it is the calendar year 2009 that should be
 removed from their average – not 2008. This approach would increase the Company
 adjustment for overtime labor expense, not decrease it.

15

16 Q. IS A THREE YEAR AVERAGE AN ACCEPTABLE PERIOD OVER WHICH TO

17 DETERMINE AN ONGOING NORMALIZED LEVEL OF EXPENSE?

18 A. Yes, a three year average is reasonable. While, one could use a two-year or even

19 four-year average and still achieve reasonable results, a three-year average has

- 20 consistently been used in past rate cases by both Staff and the Company.
- 21

22

3) ANNUAL INCENTIVE COMPENSATION COSTS

23

Q. WHAT ISSUE EXISTS REGARDING THE ANNUAL INCENTIVE COMPENSATION PLAN ("AIP")?

A. The Staff is recommending disallowance of a portion of AIP costs associated with the
 achievement of financial, customer satisfaction and individual goals in the amount of
 approximately \$335,000. The Staff is also proposing similar disallowances relative to
 Shared Services employees in the amount of approximately \$830,000.

- 5
- 6

Q. DID STAFF ELIMINATE ANY OTHER SHARED SERVICES EXPENSES?

A. Adjustments were made to reduce Belleville Laboratory costs and to impute revenue
from American Water Resources, Inc. ("AWR"). These two issues are addressed
separately. Otherwise, the differences between the Staff and Company filings are
due to wage rate differences that should be resolved in true-up.

11

12 Q. WHY DID THE STAFF PROPOSE TO DISALLOW A PORTION OF MAWC AND 13 SHARED SERVICES AIP?

A. Staff indicated that it eliminated the financial goals and certain individual goals, such as community involvement activities, due to its belief that there was no resulting benefit to MAWC's customers. Staff also indicated that the elimination of the financial goal was supported by a Commission decision in a prior Southwestern Bell Telephone rate case. Finally, while Staff did not object to a customer service goal, it did express a concern that the sample size used in the customer service survey was too small.

21

22 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE STAFF'S CONCLUSIONS?

23 A. I do not for a number of reasons. The AIP was designed to attract and retain

competent personnel, reduce expenses, maintain the financial health of the

25 Company, encourage positive interaction with our customers, improve service and

- increase operational efficiencies. All of these features of the AIP plan directly benefit 1 2 our customers.
- 3

IN WHAT WAY DO EACH OF THE STAFF DISALLOWED FEATURES OF THE AIP 4 Q. 5 PLAN BENEFIT CUSTOMERS?

The financial element of the incentive plan provides incentives to Company personnel Α. 6 related to meeting the overall financial goals of the Company. As such, employees 7 are encouraged to operate efficiently and manage costs so as to achieve the 8 financial goals. Although the Company has in place an infrastructure replacement 9 program that will necessitate rate increases, operational efficiencies and cost controls 10 serve to keep these increases lower than they would otherwise be. That is a direct 11 benefit to our customers. Moreover, a financially healthy company is better able to 12 meet its public service obligations as it can raise capital at comparatively lower cost, 13 better respond to unanticipated economic conditions, more rapidly respond to water 14 quality regulations, and meet other emergencies that happen from time to time. 15

16

MAWC believes that both its employees and customers in the communities they 17 serve benefit from community involvement and interaction. The individual goals 18 related to participation in community events provide benefits on several levels. Not 19 only does such interaction directly benefit customers MAWC serves through 20 participation in local events, it also provides an opportunity to identify problems or 21 issues that the Company otherwise might not have known exist as well as a chance 22 to educate customers in regard to programs provided by MAWC. 23

24

Finally, the elimination of customer service related goals is especially confusing. By 25 MAWC - DRW Rebuttal

definition, employee performance that results in high customer satisfaction is a direct
benefit to the customer. The Company expects and trusts its employees to achieve a
high standard of performance, but knowledge that an independent survey of a
statistical sampling of our customers regarding their performance exists, for which
they can be rewarded, can provide that extra edge toward exceptional customer
service.

7

8 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE STAFF'S ASSERTION THAT THE SURVEY

9 CONDUCTED BY THE COMPANY WAS "TOO SMALL"?

Α. No. The customer service portion of the AIP is based on two surveys, the 10 Service Quality Survey and the Customer Satisfaction Survey. The Company's 11 12 annual Service Quality Survey is conducted by Opinion Research Corporation, an independent survey firm. This firm provided a report to the Company 13 indicating that the sampling of 800 customers conducted in their survey resulted 14 in a statistical significance at a 95% confidence level of a sample tolerance of 15 16 plus or minus 3 percent. RKM Research and Communications, Inc. conducted the annual Customer Satisfaction Survey. That firm reported a sampling of 400 17 18 customers resulting in a statistical significance at a 95% confidence level of a sample tolerance of plus or minus 4.9%. The Company presented these reports 19 20 to Professor Spitznagel and he agreed that they are statistically significant.

Further, the Staff raised this same issue in the Company's last rate case, WR-2008-0311, which used a 2007 customer survey. In that case the Staff did not provide any indication that they had conducted any scientific analysis of the statistical sample size or method used by the Company to determine customer satisfaction levels. The same remains true in this case even though the

MAWC – DRW Rebuttal

1		Company more than tripled its sample size compared to the earlier survey.
2		
3	Q.	THE STAFF CITED A SOUTHWESTERN BELL CASE TO SUPPORT ITS
4		ELIMINATION OF INCENTIVE PAYMENTS. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT CITE TO BE
5		PERTINENT TO THIS CASE?
6	A.	No, I do not. The subject Report and Order indicated that the Commission's decision
7		in that case applied only to exclusion of a parent company's senior management
8		incentive programs. There was no exclusion of any local or state related incentives.
9		In MAWC's current case, the Company did not request any recovery of its parent
10		company's senior management AIP.
11		
12		4) EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
13		
14	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN STAFF AND MAWC
15		RELATING TO THE RECOVERY OF PAYROLL EXPENSE FOR MEMBERS OF
16		THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT.
17	Α.	The Staff excluded the wages and benefits associated with MAWC's Director of
18		Government Affairs, who spends a majority, although not the entirety, of his time
19		monitoring legislation that impacts the water industry in general and MAWC in
20		particular. Although his duties are similar to those performed by employees on the
21		Missouri Commission Staff and the Office of the Public Counsel, the Company has
22		not taken issue with Staff's exclusion in this case.
23		
24		However, the Company does take strong exception to the exclusion of portions of the
		The event are company does take balong exception to the excitation of pertons of the

11

1	with what the Staff refers to as "lobbying" or "nonregulated" activities. These Staff
2	disallowances include: a) 100 percent of the compensation and benefits of the
3	Manager of Government and Regulatory Affairs; b) 50% of the compensation and
4	benefits of the Senior Manager of Business Development; and c) 10% of the
5	compensation and benefits of the Manager of External Affairs.

7

Q. ARE YOU AWARE WHY THESE ADJUSTMENTS WERE MADE?

8 A. Staff indicated that these costs were eliminated based upon the review of job
9 descriptions.

10

11

Q. HOW ARE JOB DESCRIPTIONS DEVELOPED AT THE COMPANY?

Generic job descriptions are developed by the corporate Human Resources 12 Α. 13 department of American Water. They are, by design, consistent from state to state in order to assist in the grading of job classifications, job correlation, salary surveys and 14 initial position inquiries. There may be modifications in the actual job functions at the 15 16 local level that depart to some degree from the generic job description. For example, I have attached as Schedule DRW – 2 the position description of the Manager of 17 Governmental and Regulatory Affairs. There are several references to influencing 18 19 legislation and other legislative activities. However, within MAWC those activities are performed by the Director of Government Affairs. The referenced job description is a 20 dated corporate position description, approved in 2002, that does not accurately 21 reflect the incumbent's current role; but, exists solely because it is an established job 22 code that has been previously graded and approved for job classification purposes. 23

24

25 Q. WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE MAWC MANAGER OF GOVERNMENTAL AND

12

1 **REGULATORY AFFAIRS?**

A. I have attached as Schedule DRW – 2 the most recent job description for that
position. The job description, as explained previously, is a generic description that,
for purposes of establishing position grades, is standard within the American Water
corporate system. It has evolved locally but has not been changed to reflect some of
the activities of the existing role. Still, it serves as a reference point for a discussion
of the duties performed by the incumbent.

8

This position operates in a liaison role among the 91 St. Louis area municipalities and 9 St. Louis County government. It is responsible for implementing and maintaining 10 procedures that are in compliance with local governmental regulations. Because of 11 the importance of water service, fire protection infrastructure and rights-of-way 12 issues, there is a need for a central contact point for local governmental officials, and 13 this position fills that role. The Manager of Governmental and Regulatory Affairs is a 14 15 key Company representative in acquiring and renewing municipal franchise agreements, renewal of Sales for Re-sale contracts, involvement with county water 16 and sewer authorities for current and long range planning, responding to government 17 officials inquiries on behalf of their citizenry, involvement in resolution of issues 18 between municipalities for water infrastructure projects, participation in negotiations 19 on major construction projects impacting a city or fire protection district, interfacing 20 with emergency response agencies, coordinating plant security coverage, meeting 21 with local government officials on source of supply issues, acting as liaison to large 22 commercial and industrial users to provide for future water requirements, 23 coordination with St. Louis County's highway department on construction standards, 24 and representing MAWC on homeland security matters. Finally, there is an 25

13

educational aspect to this role through the presentation of environmental and 1 conservation discussions to various civic organizations and to elementary school 2 3 students.

4

6

CAN YOU GIVE EXAMPLES OF THE TYPES OF ISSUES THIS POSITION 5 Q. HOLDER ATTEMPTS TO ADDRESS?

Yes. The first example would be coordination of highway expansion efforts that 7 Α. involve movement of water main, coordination among various state and local 8 agencies and provision of information to municipalities. During the expansion of 9 Highway 141 in St. Louis County, for example, the incumbent in this position is 10 responsible for contacting and working with local officials regarding the curtailment of 11 water service while main is removed and replaced; for coordination of efforts among 12 the highway department, municipalities, private contractors and the Company in 13 timing of the replacement work; and participation in negotiation of rights-of-way 14

- matters as necessary. 15
- 16

Another example is the ongoing involvement in the need to replace a major bridge in 17 the St. Louis area, on which our water main was located. Disagreement among 18 state, county and local officials as to what party legally controlled the right-of-way for 19 our line actually threatened completion of this project until MAWC's employee 20 negotiated a settlement. 21

22

A third example would be the past educational effort conducted with members of a 23 County Highway Department after a proposal was made to change existing code 24 regulations. The Department, in a well meaning effort to maintain and improve 25

MAWC - DRW Rebuttal

1		county roads, had proposed changing backfill requirements upon completion of a
2		main repair to require replacement of dirt removed with concrete. The MAWC
3		employee was able to provide support that not only would the repairs be five times
4		more expensive for our customers, it would also limit access in the event of the need
5		for future repairs.
6		
7		Those are just three of the many examples that have occurred that demonstrate the
8		importance of this position to our customers.
9		
10	Q.	LOOKING AT THE JOB DESCRIPTION YOU HAVE ATTACHED AS SCHEDULE
11		DRW – 2, DOES THE FIRST ITEM REFER TO ARTICULATING POSITIONS ON
12		LEGISLATIVE ISSUES?
13	A.	Yes. That pertains to local governmental issues such as those I have described.
14		Likewise, the second item referring to shaping and influencing legislative programs
15		and business issues is focused on local municipal and county governments for the
16		reasons (and with the resulting customer benefits) I have already described.
17		
18	Q.	WHAT IS MEANT BY ESTABLISHING CONSTRUCTIVE RELATIONSHIPS WITH
19		OFFICIALS AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT?
20	A.	Again, that is the generic language utilized in the corporate job description. For
21		MAWC, this would include such activities as the primary contact for Homeland
22		Securities issues, as a key contact for officials who request information or have
23		concerns regarding water quality, service or conservation issues, and communicating
24		compliance and other issues to management. In short, while a limited review of a job
25		description might leave an impression that lobbying activities were part of this

1		position's duties, the fact of the matter is that the incumbent did not lobby on behalf
2		of MAWC during the test year.
3		
4	Q.	DID YOU CONFIRM THAT FACT THROUGH DISCUSSIONS WITH THE
5		MANAGER OF GOVERNMENTAL AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS?
6	A.	l did.
7		
8	Q.	DID THE STAFF INTERVIEW THE MANAGER OF GOVERNMENTAL AND
9		REGULATORY AFFAIRS TO DETERMINE WHAT ACTIVITIES HE PERFORMED
10		DURING THE YEAR BEFORE EXCLUDING 100% OF HIS WAGES AND
11		BENEFITS?
12	A.	No.
13		
14	Q.	DID THE STAFF SUBMIT ANY DATA REQUESTS TO DETERMINE HIS ACTUAL
15		JOB RELATED DUTIES CONDUCTED DURING THE YEAR?
16	Α.	No.
17		
18	Q.	OTHER THAN READING THE JOB DESCRIPTION, DID STAFF SEEK ANY
19		INFORMATION FROM MAWC IN ORDER TO VERIFY ITS ASSUMPTION?
20	A.	They did not.
21		
22	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE JOB DESCRIPTION FOR THE MANAGER OF
23		EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.
24	A.	The job description for that position is attached as Schedule DRW $- 3$. It clearly
25		indicates that this position is focused on internal and external communication issues,

1		strategies and support; development of the communications budget; and acting as
2		company spokesperson for local and state media inquiries. The only reference that
3		could potentially have been attributed to any form of lobbying activity is that this
4		position "works closely with the state government relations lead to provide
5		communications counsel, support and all necessary materials. Interfaces with local
6		elected officials and develops and sustains strong working relationship with these
7		targets." If Staff has interpreted these activities as lobbying, they have done so in
8		error.
9		- N
10	Q.	TO WHAT POSITION WOULD THE JOB DESCRIPTION BE REFERRING WHEN
11		IT REFERS TO THE STATE GOVERNMENT RELATIONS LEAD?
12	Α.	In this case, it would be the Company's Manager of Governmental and Regulatory
13		Affairs.
14		
15	Q.	DOES THE MANAGER OF GOVERNMENTAL AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
16		PERFORM ANY LOBBYING ACTIVITIES?
17	Α.	As noted earlier, he does not.
18		
19	Q.	IN WHAT CONTEXT DOES THE MANAGER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
20		INTERFACE WITH LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS?
21	A.	She would do so in the context of communications in the event of significant water
22		main breaks, scheduled and unscheduled service outages, public health events such
23		as boil orders and any other issues of general concern to local officials. The
24		incumbent in this position also coordinates the scheduling of speakers and
25		presentations when local officials or organizations request educational presentations
		17 MAWC – DRW Rebuttal

1		regarding water and wastewater topics
2		
3	Q.	ARE ANY OF THESE ACTIVITIES WHAT WOULD BE CONSIDERED LOBBYING?
4	Α.	No, they are not.
5		
6	Q.	DID YOU CONFIRM THAT FACT THROUGH DISCUSSIONS WITH THE
7		MANAGER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS?
8	Α.	I did.
9		
10	Q.	DID THE STAFF INTERVIEW THE MANAGER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS TO
11		DETERMINE WHAT ACTIVITIES SHE PERFORMED DURING THE YEAR?
12	Α.	No.
13		
14	Q.	DID THE STAFF SUBMIT ANY DATA REQUESTS TO DETERMINE HER ACTUAL
15		JOB RELATED DUTIES CONDUCTED DURING THE YEAR?
16	A.	No.
17		
18	Q.	OTHER THAN READING THE JOB DESCRIPTION, DID STAFF SEEK ANY
19		INFORMATION FROM MAWC IN ORDER TO VERIFY ITS ASSUMPTION?
20	A.	They did not.
21		
22	Q.	STAFF HAS ALSO PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF 50% OF THE PAYROLL AND
23		BENEFITS OF THE SENIOR MANAGER OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT. WHY
24		WAS THAT?
25	Α.	Through a reading of a job description, attached as Schedule DRW – 4, Staff

concluded that 50% of the time spent by the individual holding this position was spent
 on non-regulated activities.

3

4 Q. WAS THAT A CORRECT CONCLUSION?

No. About 50% of the incumbent's position is associated with responding to inquiries A. 5 from municipalities and private owners of water and wastewater facilities, and in 6 some instances to Staff, in regard to various issues and problems pertaining to 7 existing systems. The incumbent in this position investigates those issues, discusses 8 options, attempts to provide solutions and, at times, will analyze and discuss the 9 possibility of taking ownership of the systems. The remainder of the incumbent's 10 time is spent in analytical work including bulk water sales, opportunity development, 11 analysis of existing contractual agreements and review of contracts that are close to 12 expiration. However, MAWC does not provide nor investigate non-regulated 13 business services and this position holder does not work on non-regulated matters. 14 15 DID YOU CONFIRM THAT FACT THROUGH DISCUSSIONS WITH THE SENIOR Q. 16 17 MANAGER OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT?

- 18 A. I did.
- 19

20 Q. DID THE STAFF INTERVIEW THE SENIOR MANAGER OF BUSINESS

21 DEVELOPMENT TO DETERMINE WHAT ACTIVITIES HE PERFORMED DURING

22 THE YEAR BEFORE EXCLUDINGG 50% OF HIS WAGES AND BENEFITS?

23 A. No.

24

25 Q. DID THE STAFF SUBMIT ANY DATA REQUESTS TO DETERMINE HIS ACTUAL

1		JOB RELATED DUTIES CONDUCTED DURING THE YEAR?
2	A.	No.
3		
4	Q.	OTHER THAN READING THE JOB DESCRIPTION, DID STAFF SEEK ANY
5		INFORMATION FROM MAWC IN ORDER TO VERIFY ITS ASSUMPTION?
6	A.	They did not.
7		
8		5) OTHER POST-RETIREMENT EMPLOYEE BENEFIT COSTS
9		
10	Q.	DO DIFFERENCES ALSO EXIST BETWEEN THE STAFF AND COMPANY IN THE
11		DETERMINATION OF EMPLOYEE BENEFIT COSTS?
12	A.	Yes, except for other post retirement employee benefits ("OPEB"), these differences
13		exist only as a result of the historical time period utilized or because of the difference
14		in the level of annualized payroll. The Company and Staff methods for determining
15		the valuation of pro-forma employee benefits were the same. Assuming that these
16		methods are not altered, once the Commission makes a determination of the
17		appropriate payroll levels and after the true-up takes place, there should be no
18		difference between the Company and Staff position. The same is true for pro-forma
19		payroll taxes.
20		
21	Q.	WHAT IS THE ISSUE REGARDING THE STAFF'S PROPOSED LEVEL OF OPEBS
22		EXPENSE?
23	Α.	Both the Company and Staff have included \$31,901 for annual amortization of a
24		regulatory asset associated with a deferral of OPEB costs for the St. Joseph and
25		Joplin Districts from July 1, 1994 up through the effective date of the Report and
		20 MAWC – DRW Rebuttal

Order in Case No. WR-95-205. This deferral resulted from the issuance of Statement 1 #106 by the Financial Accounting Standards Board moving the accounting for post 2 retirement benefits from a pay-as-you-go to the accrual method. The change in 3 method resulted in unrecovered book expenses that were approved by the 4 Commission for deferral and twenty year amortization in the referenced case. At 5 about the same time, the Company also deferred the same type of unrecovered 6 OPEB expenses for the then St. Louis County Water Company and began amortizing 7 the deferral over a twenty year period from the date FAS 106 was first adopted for 8 financial reporting purposes. In Case No. WR-94-166, St. Louis County Water 9 proposed to include the amortization of the deferral over 19.33 years. That case was 10 settled and the Order issued did not specifically reference the OPEB deferral and 11 amortization. The amortization continues and the Company believes that recovery of 12 the \$44,056 annual amortization is appropriate. Likewise, rate base treatment of the 13 unamortized deferral of \$117,483 at April 30, 2010 is appropriate. Such treatment 14 has never been disallowed by previous Commission Order and is consistent with the 15 precedent established by the Commission's treatment and approval of the St. Joseph 16 and Joplin deferrals mentioned earlier. Exclusion of this item from rate base would 17 result in the Company having to write-off to expense the deferred amount at the time 18 new rates become effective, which is estimated will be \$99,126. 19 20 6) AWR REVENUES 21

Q. STAFF IMPUTES REVENUES OF \$75,635 ASSOCIATED WITH CERTAIN SERVICE LINE AND IN-HOME PLUMBING PROTECTION PROGRAMS MANAGED BY AMERICAN WATER RESOURCES (AWR). DO YOU AGREE

22

21

WITH THIS ADJUSTMENT?

A. No, I do not. The imputed revenues proposed by Staff are not supported and the
logic on which Staff bases its adjustment is flawed.

4

5 Q. HOW HAS STAFF JUSTIFIED THEIR ADJUSTMENT?

A. Staff apparently assumes that AWR earns a 50 percent profit on every dollar it
makes. Staff then assumes that 25% of the implicit profit of one line of AWR
business is attributable to actions taken by MAWC and that 12.5% of the other two
lines of business is attributable to the Company. While no explanation for the level of
profit margin or attribution to MAWC is made, the general justification appears to be
based largely on discontinued practices and a stretch of logic.

12

13 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

14 Three pages of the Staff Report are dedicated to explaining AWR business practices Α. 15 that are performed for MAWC customers. Emphasis is placed on the fact that AWR markets to MAWC customers with little comment given to the other markets that 16 AWR serves and with no indication that any business relationship exists between the 17 Company and AWR. While the two are affiliates, they operate completely 18 independently and neither has access to the other's non-public information. The 19 service performed by AWR is very similar to that provided by St. Louis County, where 20 the great majority of MAWC's customers are located, except that it is a private 21 enterprise subject to market competition. The only substance to the Staff's argument 22 seems to be that seven years ago AWR sent mailings using the Missouri American 23 logo to individuals on the MAWC customer list from AWR and that about one-third of 24 those mailings included a letter of endorsement from the Company's president. 25

22

2 Q. DOES MAWC STILL PROVIDE CUSTOMER LISTS OR PROVIDE LETTERS OF 3 ENDORSEMENT?

A. As noted in the Staff Report, the Company has not done so for over six years.

5

4

6 Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THERE WAS VALUE GAINED BY AWR THROUGH USE 7 INFORMATION FROM THE MAWC CUSTOMER LIST?

I believe there was little value then and even less, if any, today. The service territory Α. 8 of MAWC is public information. Zip codes associated with that service territory are 9 and were publicly available. Likewise, mailing lists by zip code were available at little 10 or no cost and other more targeted mailing lists were available from outside vendors 11 at low cost. Staff's allegation that the AWR marketing campaign by mail could not 12 have taken place without the MAWC captive customer list is simply erroneous. Use 13 of the MAWC customer information was a matter of convenience rather than 14 necessity. AWR could have easily had the same level of success in meeting 15 business objectives without the MAWC customer list. Moreover, according to Staff's 16 reported income figures and estimated profit margins, AWR is apparently succeeding 17 in attracting customers today without access to any MAWC customer information. 18

19

20 Q. WHY DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ANY BENEFIT RECEIVED WOULD HAVE LESS 21 VALUE TODAY?

A. Staff argues that the customer list and endorsements led to market penetration that
would not otherwise have been achieved. As explained above, I do not believe this
to be the case. But even if Staff's assumption was true, given the fact that people
move, that people die and that people discontinue their services, it is unlikely that the

- majority of today's AWR customers are the same that were theoretically influenced
 by the original mailings.
- 3

4 Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE AREAS OF THE STAFF'S REPORT REGARDING 5 AWR THAT ARE MISLEADING?

Yes, I do. In its discussion of the AWR program, Staff indicates that if a customer 6 Α. experiences a water leak, they must contact MAWC to investigate. The Report goes 7 on to say that AWR does not compensate MAWC for the use of its employees who 8 were dispatched to determine the source of water leaks. The statement might just as 9 well have read that customers who drive Ford pick-up trucks must contact MAWC to 10 investigate water leaks, but that Ford does not compensate MAWC for investigating. 11 12 While the statement itself is true, there is a perceived implication that AWR is receiving some kind of inappropriate benefit or special treatment. However, it is 13 MAWC's obligation to check every water leak to determine whether or not the leak is 14 on Company owned property. This is true no matter who the customer and no matter 15 whether they have purchased a service or product from any outside vendor, including 16 AWR. 17

18

Another example is the Staff Report statement that, "According to the brochure
 mailed to MAWC customers, this program provides...". While the statement is
 correct, it is equally correct that the brochure mailed to AWR prospects that are not
 MAWC customers contains that same information.

23

24 Q. WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MAWC AND AWR?

25 A. None, other than the fact that they are both subsidiaries of American Water.

2 Q. YOU MENTIONED THAT ST. LOUIS COUNTY OPERATES ITS OWN SERVICE 3 LINE PROTECTION PROGRAM. PLEASE DESCRIBE THAT PROGRAM.

A. Section 66.405, RSMo (along with a subsequent vote of the people) authorized St.
Louis County to operate its own mandatory service line protection program. This
program operates in a manner similar to the AWR program. That is, the customer
pays a periodic fee and, in exchange, St. Louis County is responsible for certain
repairs associated with customer-owned lines.

9

10 Q. WHAT SERVICES DOES MAWC PERFORM IN REGARD TO THE ST. LOUIS 11 COUNTY PROGRAM?

12 A. MAWC performs all billing and collection functions associated with the St. Louis

13 County program. This necessarily includes the use of MAWC's customer list.

14

15 Q. DOES THE COUNTY PAY FOR THE USE OF THE CUSTOMER LIST?

A. Perhaps implicitly. MAWC receives one percent (1%) of the gross revenues collected in exchange for its services. Obviously, most, if not all, of this payment is to reimburse MAWC for the direct costs associated with billing and collection. MAWC does not perform a billing and collection function for AWR. Thus, if one were to assume that only 90% of the payment was for billing and collection services and the remaining was due to use of the customer list, only one tenth of one percent (.1%) of

22 the gross revenues would be assumed to be for the customer list.

23

24 Q. WHAT IS .1% OF THE GROSS REVENUES OF AWR?

25 A. According to Staff figures that would amount to about \$836.

1		
2		7) <u>RATE CASE EXPENSE</u>
3		
4	Q. 🧋	WHAT IS THE ISSUE REGARDING RATE CASE EXPENSE?
5	Α.	There are two issues. The first relates to the recovery of unamortized rate case
6		expense.
7		
8	Q.	WHAT IS THE COMPANY'S POSITION IN REGARD TO UNAMORTIZED RATE
9		CASE EXPENSE?
10	Α.	MAWC has proposed deferral of the actual costs incurred to prepare and process this
11		rate case and to amortize those costs over a two year period. In addition, as a result
12		of the timing and settlement in the last two rate cases, \$140,872 of rate case
13		expense from prior cases will remain unamortized at the end of September 2010.
14		This balance represents cost expended by the Company that they have not had the
15		opportunity to recover. MAWC's proposed solution to this problem is to amortize the
16		unamortized balance of rate case expense over the next two years.
17		
18	Q.	ARE THERE ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS IN REGARD TO RECOVERY OF
19		UNAMORTIZED RATE CASE EXPENSE BALANCES?
20	Α.	Yes, both Staff and the Office of the Public Counsel ("OPC") argue that the Company
21		should not be allowed to recover the uncollected portion of the deferred rate case
22		expense, thus denying the Company the opportunity to recover some of the costs of
23		prior rate cases. The Staff Report states that it is now the policy of Staff to allow
24		recovery of "normalized" rate case expense and not amounts related to past
25		proceedings. Staff's proposal would require the Company to currently write-off to
		26 MAWC – DRW Rebuttal

-1
-
_

expense the \$140,872 of unrecoverable rate case expense.

2

CAN YOU EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NORMALIZATION OF 3 Q. EXPENSES AS PROPOSED BY STAFF AND AMORTIZATION AS PROPOSED 4 BY THE COMPANY? 5 Yes. Normalization is the process of estimating what costs or revenues will be in the 6 Α. future and establishing rates accordingly. Amortization is the process of taking a 7 known amount and spreading it over a fixed period of time in the future. 8 9 IN A RATEMAKING CONTEXT, WHEN IS IT APPROPRIATE TO USE 10 Q. NORMALIZATION? 11 It s often necessary to normalize income statement items when setting rates. That is 12 Α. because revenues and expenses can fluctuate and are unpredictable. For example, 13 a wet summer can drastically reduce revenues; increased water turbidity can cause 14 chemical usage to increase; and economic conditions can cause operating and 15 maintenance costs to fluctuate. Therefore, the parties to rate case proceedings often 16 develop methods to establish a normal level of revenue and expenses that is 17 different from the test year - to "normalize" the income statement to reflect costs that 18 are expected to occur at the time rates are in effect. 19 20 On the other hand, there are certain costs that can be measured and do not require 21 estimation. Rate case expense has historically been treated in this manner. 22 Because it is difficult to predict the cost to develop, prepare and present a rate case 23

24 and because those costs may differ substantially depending upon whether a

27

25 settlement is reached or a hearing with its requisite expert witnesses and legal briefs

1		are required, parties have typically waited until near the end of the case to establish a
2		more exact measure of actual costs incurred. After the fact, those costs are deferred
3		on the balance sheet and amortized to expense over a period of time.
4		
5	Q.	IS THE STAFF "NORMALIZATION" APPROACH AN ACCEPTABLE METHOD?
6	Α.	I do not believe so. However, if the Commission chose to move toward a
7		normalization approach, it should do so on a prospective basis only.
8		
9	Q.	WHY?
10	A.	As a result of its settlements in the last two rate cases and in accordance with
11		precedent established in prior cases, MAWC booked an asset expecting to be able to
12		receive full recovery through the ratemaking process. That has not occurred to date
13		and under the Staff's approach would never occur. If the Staff's recommendation to
14		disallow previously unrecovered rate case expenses is adopted, it will require MAWC
15		to write-off the recorded asset, thereby reflecting a loss and denying the Company a
16		valid opportunity to earn its authorized rate of return.
17		
18	Q.	DO YOU BELIEVE STAFF'S ADJUSTMENT IN THIS CASE IS REFLECTIVE OF
19		NORMALIZATION RATEMAKING?
20	Α.	No. Staff may be calling their methodology normalization now in order to justify
21		exclusion of unamortized costs from recovery, but Staff has not changed its
22		approach. In other words, the amortization technique has remained the same but the
23		name has changed.
24		
25		If Staff followed its typical method of normalization, Staff would select some period,

perhaps three years, over which to develop a normalized rate case expense. They
have not done so in this case. Instead, for recovery of costs associated with the
current case, Staff has used the same approach historically employed by
recommending amortization over a two year period of actual costs incurred. By
definition, that is not normalization.

6

7 Q. COULD AN AVERAGE BE USED TO DEVELOP A NORMALIZED ANNUAL RATE 8 CASE EXPENSE?

It is a technique that could be used. However, there are complexities in approaching 9 Α. the determination of the appropriate level of expense in that manner. First, prior rate 10 cases may have been settled while the current case goes to trial, or vice versa, with 11 vast cost differentials as a result. Second, one of the items the Company considers 12 when settling a case is the cost savings of avoiding hearings. Normalization through 13 the traditional averaging concept would give the Company a perverse incentive 14 toward avoiding settlements in order to sustain as high a going forward revenue 15 requirement as possible. 16

17

18 Q. ARE THERE ANY OTHER ITEMS OF CONCERN REGARDING THE STAFF'S

19

APPROACH TO THIS ISSUE?

A. Yes. As noted previously, it has been the practice to "true-up" or identify actual rate case expense as late in the process as possible so as to incorporate the majority of costs that are associated with the rate case proceedings. It is not clear from the Staff's testimony whether that will continue to be the case or whether costs to be considered will be cut-off at April 30th, the true-up date established by the Commission in this case. If the latter is the case, the Company would obviously have

- 1 no opportunity to ever recover its prudently incurred costs because a significant
- 2 portion of rate case expenses are always incurred after the normal true-up date.
- 3

4 Q. WHAT IS THE SECOND ISSUE IN REGARD TO RATE CASE EXPENSE?

- 5 A. OPC Witness Ted Robertson has filed testimony indicating that it is his belief that the 6 costs associated with outside consultants and outside legal counsel should be 7 excluded from recovery. He then states that remaining rate case expenses should 8 be reduced by 50% and amortized over a two year period.
- 9

10 Q. WHAT IS THE VALUE OF THIS REDUCTION?

A. He does not indicate that in his testimony, but I believe that if his suggestions were
 followed, the Company would recover about \$224,000 over the two year rate case
 amortization period. That is compared to the \$862,000 the Company has estimated it
 will incur to process this rate case to hearing.

15

16 Q. WHAT WOULD BE THE FINANCIAL RESULT IF THE OPC RECOMMENDATION

17 WAS ADOPTED BY THE COMMISSION?

- 18 A. The Company would be required to write-off almost \$640,000 of the costs.
- 19

20 Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THE OPC ARGUMENT HAS MERIT?

- A. No, I believe it is substantially flawed in both theory and practicality.
- 22

23 Q. WHAT IS YOUR THEORETICAL DISAGREEMENT?

- A. Mr. Robertson asserts that there should be a sharing of prudent expenditures
- 25 incurred to prepare and present a rate case because both ratepayers and

shareholders benefit from rate cases. In making this assertion, Mr. Robertson is 1 demonstrating either a lack of knowledge of or choosing to ignore the history of 2 regulation. Distribution utilities exist as monopolies because of economic and other 3 4 advantages to the public to be organized in that manner. Because they are 5 monopolies, they are regulated for the protection of the customer. In fact, the 6 mission statement of this Commission refers to the protection of the consumer. The 7 Commission fulfills this mission of customer protection, in part, through the 8 establishment of fair prices using the rate case process. It is difficult to conceive of a 9 business entity that would desire to have its prices set by an outside party; however, that is a process to which regulated utilities are subjected in return for their monopoly 10 11 status. Regulation of utilities came into existence in large part because of the pricing 12 policies of public utility holding companies and rightly so. It is true that utilities must 13 file a rate request to have a chance to increase rates; however, they do so because 14 the regulatory process and rate cases are established by law and that law was 15 established for the protection of the customer.

16

17 Q. WHAT ARE YOUR PRACTICAL ISSUES WITH THE OPC RECOMMENDATION?

18 Α. In practice, the recommendation is unfeasible. Mr. Robertson suggests that because 19 MAWC has many employees with college degrees and work experience, that the 20 Company's existing work force can be utilized to prepare and prosecute a rate case. 21 MAWC attempts to operate a lean workforce. Employees are already fully engaged 22 in their daily responsibilities of providing water and wastewater services to the Company's customers. They are not sitting around idly, as Mr. Robertson apparently 23 24 believes, but are carrying out their duties on a daily basis. Diversion of existing employees to address the peak workloads of rate cases could result in lower 25

31

customer service and jeopardize meeting legal obligations.

2

Q. WHY DOES MAWC UTILIZE OUTSIDE COUNSEL AND CONSULTANTS RATHER 4 THAN HIRING ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL?

5 A. MAWC has made a conscious decision to hire outside counsel and consultants for 6 those projects that are specialized and do not occur on an annual basis. This allows 7 the Company to employ persons with greater expertise and a wider skill-set than in-8 house employees would normally possess. Moreover, this approach is more cost 9 effective because it allows for the employment of individuals on an as-needed basis 10 rather than hiring individuals at the salary and benefit levels of full-time employees 11 even though some of their time would be non-productive.

12

13 Q. DOES MAWC ATTEMPT TO CONTROL THE COSTS OF ITS OUTSIDE

14 CONSULTANTS AND ATTORNEYS?

A. Yes, it does. The Company issued requests for proposals for its consultants in the 15 present case except for the depreciation witness who already had a distinct price 16 advantage because he was updating a previous depreciation study rather than 17 building one from scratch. All legal bills and consulting fees are closely scrutinized 18 and employee expenses associated with the rate case are monitored to insure that all 19 expenses are reasonable and prudent. In addition, the Company makes use of in-20 house personnel where possible. For example in-house legal counsel are actively 21 involved in rate cases in a variety of areas (e.g. coordinating discovery, public 22 23 hearings, and rate issues). However, retaining a sufficient number of regulatory lawyers in-house on a permanent basis is less efficient and ultimately more 24 expensive than using outside counsel. 25

2	Q.	DO YOU HAVE OTHER COMMENTS ON THIS MATTER?
3	Α.	Yes. I would like to note that in a number of instances the rate case costs incurred
4		are outside the control of the Company. The number of data requests, number of
5		issues, complexity of issues, and other matters are often driven by the number of
6		intervening parties, Staff, and the OPC (17 total parties in this proceeding).
7		
8		Finally, it is my understanding that the Company is entitled to a reasonable
9		opportunity to recover all prudently incurred costs used to provide utility service to
10		customers. This would include the opportunity to recover all prudent costs incurred in
11		the development and prosecution of this rate case.
12		
13		8) CEDAR HILL WASTEWATER PLANT
14		a.
15	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ISSUE YOU WISH TO ADDRESS REGARDING THE
16		CEDAR HILL WASTEWATER FACILITIES.
17	Α.	Company Witness Kevin Dunn has addressed why the Cedar Hill Wastewater
18		facilities are used and useful and should not be disallowed from rate base in this
19		case as proposed by Staff. My testimony is limited to the accounting treatment that
20		would be required if the Commission adopted the Staff recommendation.
21		
22	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ACCOUNTING TREATMENT THAT WOULD RESULT.
	A.	The Company is required to follow generally accepted accounting principles
23		
23 24		("GAAP") in reporting its financial results. It also is subject to outside audit and must
		("GAAP") in reporting its financial results. It also is subject to outside audit and must comply with the findings of its external auditors or face the possibility of a qualified
auditors' report on the Company's annual financial statements. Subsequent to the 1 Sarbanes Oxley legislation passed several years ago, outside auditors' will not make 2 recommendations as to the appropriate accounting treatment for individual 3 transactions. They will only review the Company's accounting in the course of their 4 annual audit and opine after the Company has preliminarily closed its books. 5 Therefore, the Company has not received an opinion from its outside auditors as to 6 the appropriate accounting treatment of such a disallowance. However, an internal 7 review of this issue and outside counsel from a member of the Financial Accounting 8 Standards Board committee at the time of approval of Statement of Financial 9 Accounting Standards No. 90, entitled "Regulated Enterprises – Accounting for 10 Abandonments and Disallowances of Plant Costs," both conclude that if the 11 Commission accepts the Staff's position, the Company would be required to write off 12 to expense the net plant balance less contributions at the date new rates go into 13 effect. This amount would be approximately \$1,140,000. 14 15 9) COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING STUDY 16 17 HAS ANY PARTY IN DIRECT TESTIMONY TAKEN A POSITION AGAINST THE 18 Q. INCLUSION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING STUDY ("CPS") IN RATE 19 BASE IN THIS CASE AND SUBSEQUENT CAPITALIZATION OF BUSINESS 20 21 **TRANSFORMATION COSTS?** Yes, although OPC indicated that further review of the costs and purpose of the 22 Α. comprehensive planning study was necessary before that office could give its support 23 to the recovery of the CPS costs. Company witness John Young has provided 24 testimony supporting the purpose of the comprehensive planning study. Again, my 25 MAWC - DRW Rebuttal 34

comments are limited to the accounting impact if the costs of this study were
 disallowed from recovery.

3

4 Q. WHAT WOULD BE THE ACCOUNTING IMPACT?

Disallowance of the comprehensive planning study would result in an immediate 5 Α. write-off to expense of the \$825,466 currently incurred and capitalized and another 6 \$105,396 expected to be incurred by April 30th. From a more practical standpoint, it 7 would also be sending a message to the Company that the Commission does not see 8 the need for budget billing, internet billing capabilities, secure transfer of personal 9 information, self service inquiries or any of the other myriad customer service 10 improvements, not to mention necessary internal improvements and efficiencies, that 11 would be available through completion of the project. These and all other project 12 solutions addressed by the Comprehensive Planning Study would be jeopardized if 13 the business transformation project is not considered appropriate. 14

15

16 Q. YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED UNAMORTIZED PRIOR RATE CASE EXPENSE,

17 UNAMORTIZED ST. LOUIS COUNTY OPEB COSTS, ELIMINATION OF CURRENT

18 RATE CASE COSTS FROM RECOVERY, AND EXCLUSION OF THE CEDAR HILL

19 PLANT AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING STUDY AS ISSUES THAT WOULD

20 RESULT IN COMPANY WRITE-OFFS IF THE COMMISSION DOES NOT ACCEPT

21 THE COMPANY POSITION. WHAT WOULD BE THE FINANCIAL IMPACT OF

22 THOSE WRITE-OFFS?

A. If it was necessary to recognize all these losses as a result of a Commission
 decision, the write-offs would amount to almost \$3,000,000. A write-off of that
 amount represents approximately 17% of MAWC's 2009 net income. A loss in net

MAWC - DRW Rebuttal

income to that extent would have reduced the Company's 2009 equity return by
 about 20 percent.

3

10) ALLOCATION OF BELLEVILLE LAB COSTS 4 5 STAFF PROPOSES A REDUCTION OF MAWC'S EXPENSE TO REALLOCATE 6 Q. THE INDIRECT PORTION OF THE BELLEVILLE LAB SERVICE COMPANY 7 COSTS BASED ON AN AVERAGE OF THE NUMBER OF TEST ANALYSES 8 PERFORMED AS OPPOSED TO AN ALLOCATION OF COSTS BASED ON THE 9 NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS. WHAT IS THE BELLEVILLE LAB SERVICE 10 11 COMPANY? The Belleville Lab is a water quality testing facility located in Belleville, Illinois that is 12 Α. 13 operated by American Water Works Service Company. This facility performs sample 14 testing for the American Water operating companies including MAWC. 15 16 Q. DOES THE USE OF THE BELLEVILLE LAB PROVIDE SAVINGS FOR MAWC 17 AND ITS CUSTOMERS? Yes. The Belleville Lab conducts a survey to compare its testing costs to those of 18 Α. outside testing laboratories. Past studies have found outside labs to be consistently 19 more expensive. Also, outside testing labs will charge higher fees for evaluation of 20 21 "rush" samples. The Belleville Lab does not. 22 HOW DOES THE BELLEVILLE LAB ALLOCATE COSTS TO MAWC? 23 Q. Those costs directly attributable to MAWC are charged accordingly. The indirect 24 Α. costs are allocated to each of the operating companies in the American Water 25

36

MAWC - DRW Rebuttal

1

system based on customer count.

2

3 Q. HOW DOES STAFF PROPOSE TO ALLOCATE THE INDIRECT COSTS FOR 4 RATEMAKING PURPOSES?

5 A. The Staff Report proposes an adjustment that would represent an allocation of the 6 indirect costs based on an average of the number of test analyses performed on all 7 samples that were submitted to the Belleville Lab over the last five calendar years.

8

9 Q. WHY DOES STAFF BELIEVE THAT NUMBERS OF TESTS IS A MORE 10 APPROPRIATE METHOD FOR THE ALLOCATION OF THESE INDIRECT 11 COSTS?

- A. Staff is concerned that MAWC is receiving an allocation of indirect costs of
 approximately 15.29%, while MAWC's portion of test analyses represents about
 5.64% of the total tests performed.
- 15

16 Q. ARE THESE PERCENTAGES LIKELY TO BE THE SAME EVERY YEAR?

17 A. No. An operating company's total samples can vary from one year to the next 18 because of source water conditions, contamination events and regulations. Thus, an 19 operating company's portion of Belleville Lab costs could vary widely from one year 20 to the next. I will discuss this later in my rebuttal testimony.

21

22 Q. IS THE USE OF CUSTOMER COUNTS MORE STABLE?

- A. Yes. Customer counts are much less variable and do not change dramatically from
 year to year on a system-wide basis.
- 25

1 Q. DOES AWW ALLOCATE COSTS DIFFERENTLY FROM STATE TO STATE?

No. It is system-wide policy to allocate Service Company expenses on the basis of 2 Α. the number of customers that cannot be direct charged to operating companies. 3 Doing so makes practical sense, is easy to manage and administer and it provides 4 for system-wide consistency over multiple jurisdictions. Customer numbers are 5 currently used to allocate service company costs related to accounting, 6 administration, communications, corporate secretarial and legal, customer services, 7 engineering, financial human resources, information systems, operations, rate and 8 revenues and risk management. If each of these services is examined on a Missouri-9 only basis for an alternative allocation methodology, I suspect that some alternatives 10 would increase costs currently allocated to MAWC. 11

12

13 Q. WHY IS CONSISTENCY FROM STATE TO STATE IMPORTANT?

A. Applying different allocation methods from one jurisdiction to another will undoubtedly lead to a situation where AW is unable to recover all of its Belleville Lab costs. Such a loss would either drive up the cost of service to operating companies or, in the alternative, encourage the use of outside labs whose costs, while higher, would likely be recovered in total.

19

20 Q. ARE THERE SIGNIFICANT SWINGS IN THE LEVEL OF TEST ANALYSES 21 PERFORMED BY THE VARIOUS STATES THAT HIGHLIGHT THE NEED FOR 22 CONSISTENCY?

A. Yes. Attached is Rebuttal Schedule DRW – 5, which shows the percentage of test
 analyses for each state to the total AW system by year since 2003. The minimum
 and maximum percentage values for each state over the five year period are

38

MAWC – DRW Rebuttal

identified and a percentage variance is calculated. As shown the percentage
variances are extremely significant. For example, MAWC's minimum and maximum
percentages vary by 38.14%. For the state of New Mexico, the percentage variance
in the minimum and maximum is over 1,800%. In fact, eight out of the total of 17
states have a percentage variance that exceeded 80%.

6

7 Q. DOES THE USE OF TEST SAMPLES INCENT ANY OTHER BEHAVIOR?

8 A. Focusing on the number of samples could create a situation where an operating 9 company would have the opportunity to directly reduce its costs by reducing the 10 number of sample tests it asks to be performed. Such an operating incentive is not in 11 the best interests of public safety and one that is discouraged by allocating costs 12 based on customer counts.

13

14 Q. WHAT IS THE CONSEQUENCE OF STAFF'S BELLEVILLE LAB15REALLOCATION?

16 A. Staff's reallocation would reduce MAWC's expense by \$356,498.

17

18 Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION?

19 A. The current allocation method for Belleville Lab costs is functioning effectively and is 20 widely accepted by regulators. Any perceived benefits from changing to multiple 21 allocation methods would be off set by the overall impact on a service company 22 system that is providing benefits for MAWC's customers. The Commission should 23 not accept Staff's proposal to reallocate Belleville Lab costs based on test analyses 24 performed.

1		11) <u>SECURITY COSTS – AAO</u>
2		15
3	Q.	WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE SECURITY COSTS AAO ISSUE?
4	Α.	The Company included in rate base the unamortized balance of the regulatory
5		asset associated with security costs. Both Staff and OPC oppose inclusion of the
6		unamortized balance in rate base.
7		
8	Q.	PLEASE BRIEFLY DISCUSS THE SECURITY AAO.
9	Α.	In Commission Case No. WO-2002-273, the Commission authorized the Company to
10		defer certain costs associated with security measures taken by the Company in the
11		aftermath of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. The Company was authorized
12		to defer the costs it incurred during a two-year period ending on September 11, 2003.
13		The Company was also authorized to amortize the costs over a 10-year period. The
14		Company began amortizing the costs in December 2002, upon receipt of the
15		Commission's Report and Order.
16		
17	Q.	WHAT IS THE RESULT OF INCLUDING AN ITEM IN RATE BASE IN THE
18		DETERMINATION OF REVENUE REQUIREMENTS?
19	Α.	Amortization of an asset account provides for the return of the amount expended
20		over a period of time. Inclusion of the unrecovered portion of costs in rate base
21		provides for a return on that investment. Recovery of only the amortization over a
22		long period of time does not allow a Company to be made whole. Not only does the
23		Company receive no return on its investment, the recovery through amortization over
24		a long period of time returns the Company's investment in dollars that are less
25		valuable than when they were invested.

1

2 Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THE COMPANY SHOULD BE AFFORDED RATE BASE 3 TREATMENT FOR THE UNAMORTIZED BALANCE OF THE REGULATORY 4 ASSET FOR SECURITY COSTS?

Yes. The Company incurred the costs to provide security to its production and 5 Α. distribution systems, its offices, its customers, and its employees. The sole result of 6 7 this investment of capital was the continued provision of safe and adequate service to MAWC's customers as the security expenditures were made to protect customers 8 9 and the assets that serve them. Therefore, rate base treatment of the unamortized 10 balance is appropriate. Just because costs are treated on the balance sheet as 11 deferred items rather than as plant investment is no reason for different treatment in 12 terms of allowing the Company to earn a fair return on its money invested. Capital 13 dollars were invested in security measures for the benefit of the system and its 14 customers and the Company should be allowed to earn a return on that capital just 15 as it would have been had the investment been recorded to a plant account. The manner in which an item is treated for accounting purposes should not dictate what is 16 17 appropriate for recovery in rates.

18

19

12) <u>SECURITY COSTS – DEFERRED TAXES</u>

20

21 Q. IS THERE ANOTHER ISSUE REGARDING THE SECURITY AAO ASSET?

A. Yes, there is a difference in opinion regarding the treatment of deferred taxes associated with the Security AAO costs that have been deferred. In its direct filing, Staff excluded the AAO from rate base and consistently excluded the associated deferred taxes as well. OPC takes the position that the rate base item was properly

MAWC - DRW Rebuttal

excluded but that the related deferred taxes should be used to reduce rate base further. The Company, of course, believes that both the costs and associated deferred taxes should be included in rate base. Staff and Company positions, while at odds, are internally consistent. OPC's position is not internally consistent.

5

G. IF THE COMMISSION DOES NOT ALLOW MAWC TO EARN A RETURN ON THE UNAMORTIZED BALANCE OF THE SECURITY AAO, WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION IN REGARD TO THE DEFERRED TAX RATE BASE 9 REDUCTION?

If the Company is not allowed to earn a return on the unamortized balance of the 10 Α. Security AAO asset, then the deferred taxes associated with the AAO asset should 11 not be used to reduce rate base. If the Company is allowed a return on the 12 remaining Security AAO balance, then the associated deferred taxes should be 13 included as a rate base reduction. It is neither fair nor reasonable to include a rate 14 15 base reduction for the deferred taxes associated with the Security AAO asset without recognizing the very same asset as an addition to rate base. This treatment would 16 cause a mismatch in the revenue requirement model in that the customers will 17 receive the benefit of the deferred tax deduction without having to pay for the 18 Security AAO asset in rate base. 19

20

21 Q. IS OPC CORRECT THAT THE COMPANY HAS RECEIVED A CASH FLOW 22 BENEFIT FROM THE DEFERRAL OF TAXES ASSOCIATED WITH THE AAO?

A. Certainly, but OPC ignores the fact that the Company has also invested capital on which they will not receive any return given Public Counsel's position. By way of example, assume that the deferred security assets were the only investments made

MAWC - DRW Rebuttal

by the Company. OPC's recommendation would mean that the Company would receive no revenue as a return on their invested capital, but instead would be required to make payments to its customers for the privilege and expense of making the water system more safe and secure. No prudent business person would continue to make investments under that scenario.

- 6
- 7

13) ST. JOSEPH DISTRICT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT RATES

8

9 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TARIFF THAT IS IN 10 PLACE IN THE ST. JOSEPH DISTRICT.

The St. Joseph District has in place two economic development contracts that have Α. 11 been approved by the Commission. The Triumph Foods (Premium Pork) contract 12 was approved in Case No. WT-224-0192 on November 3, 2003, with the tariff sheets 13 becoming effective for service rendered on and after November 25, 2003. The 14 Nestle Purina Petcare contract was approved in Case No: WO-2009-0043 on 15 September 3, 2008, for service on and after September 12, 2008. As part of its 16 application in those cases, the Company submitted specific cost information to justify 17 the proposed contract rates. 18

19

20 Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE REGARDING THESE RATES?

A. AGP witness Donald Johnstone asserts that those two companies on an economic development rate tariff in St. Joseph are paying rates that are not cost based and are therefore discriminatory. He proposes as a solution to that perceived issue either an imputation of revenues at the existing industrial rates or the establishment, in effect, of a special customer class. Company witness Paul Herbert will address Mr. 1 Johnstone's latter recommendation. My testimony will address the imputation of 2 revenue.

- 3
- 4

Q. WHAT IS IMPUTED REVENUE?

It is revenue that does not actually exist. For purposes of determining the revenue 5 Α. requirements in this case, the parties would pretend that MAWC is earning revenue 6 Mr. Johnstone's recommendation is that the that it does not really receive. 7 Commission should pretend that the economic development contract customers are 8 paying the same rates as other industrial customers and therefore would add 9 \$1,069,623 to the revenues MAWC actually received for the twelve months ending 10 March 31, 2010. 11

12

13 Q. IS THE IMPUTATION OF REVENUE APPROPRIATE?

14 A. Certainly not in this case.

15

16 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN.

Mr. Johnstone's conclusions are based upon the assumption that the economic 17 Α. development contract customers are currently on the water distribution system and 18 that as a result they should pay the same rates as other industrial customers with 19 similar costs. What he ignores, however, is the history of the development of the 20 economic development tariff. Prior to 2003 MAWC was approached by officials of 21 the City of St. Joseph and members of the St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce. They 22 suggested that if MAWC could institute an economic development tariff, new 23 industrial customers would be attracted to the area, benefitting the St. Joseph 24 economy. Moreover, as long as the rates were established at a level to generate 25

MAWC - DRW Rebuttal

1 revenue in excess of marginal costs, existing customers would benefit from the 2 additional revenue contribution toward fixed costs.

3

4 Q. DID THE COMPANY ACCEPT THIS PROPOSAL?

The Company developed an economic development tariff and, first with the arrival of 5 Α. Triumph, then with the expansion of Nestle-Purina, analyzed the impact and 6 determined that entering into economic development contracts was in the best 7 interests of all MAWC's customers in the applicable district. The Company took this 8 recommendation to the Commission, which approved the contracts as noted 9 previously. In entering into these contracts, the Company has been mindful of the 10 best interests of its customers and complied with the Orders of this Commission. 11 Even if the Commission was to determine that the economic development tariffs are 12 no longer necessary, it would not be right to punish the Company through imputation 13 of revenue. 14

15

16 Q. IS IT YOUR OPINION THAT AGP AND OTHER INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS HAVE 17 BENEFITTED FROM THE PRESENCE OF NEW LOAD IN ST. JOSEPH?

Yes. Company witness Herbert has calculated that the economic development tariff 18 Α. revenues are in excess of the marginal costs of the new customer loads. Therefore, 19 a lower revenue contribution is required from other customers than would have 20 existed without the additional load. In short, while other industrial customer rates are 21 not as low as they would be if Triumph and Nestle-Purina were paying rates at the 22 higher industrial rates, those other industrial customers are still paying lower rates 23 than would have been the case had Triumph not come to town and Nestle not 24 expanded its operations. 25

1

2 3

14) METROPOLITAN SEWER DISTRICT ("MSD") CONTRACT

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CONTRACT BETWEEN MSD AND MAWC?
A. MAWC provides billing data services to MSD at a flat fee. Revenue received is
recorded above the line and, therefore, as long as it exceeds the marginal cost of
providing the services, benefits other customers in the St. Louis district.

9

Q. HAS THE COMPANY PREPARED AN INCREMENTAL COST STUDY

10 PERTAINING TO THE MSD CONTRACT?

A. Yes, prior to the filing of the Company's last rate case, MAWC contracted for the
 completion of an incremental cost study that showed that the revenues received were

13 well in excess of the marginal cost of providing the billing data. In addition, the study

- 14 determined that based upon an allocation of operating costs between MAWC and
- 15 MSD on which utility directly benefits from the data, the annual amount to be charged
- 16 to MSD would be in excess of what is currently charged.
- 17

18 Q. WHAT WAS THE TREATMENT OF THE MSD CONTRACT IN THE LAST RATE

- 19 **CASE?**
- A. No party objected to a settlement between MSD and MAWC leaving the contract rate
 constant.
- 22

23 Q. WAS THE EXISTING MSD CONTRACT LATER APPROVED BY THE

- 24 COMMISSION?
- 25 A. Yes. It was approved in Case No. WO-2008-0240 (issued April 1, 2008).

1 WHAT IS MAWC'S PROPOSAL IN THIS CASE? 2 Q. MAWC is proposing no change in the existing amount it charges to MSD for the 3 Α. provision of water usage and customer billing data. For purposes of this case, 4 MAWC has included the full contract price in annualized revenues. 5 6 HAVE PARTIES IN THIS CASE TAKEN ISSUE WITH THE MSD CONTRACT? 7 Q. OPC believes the annual amount should be based on an allocation of fully distributed 8 Α. cost, not incremental or negotiated costs to produce the information. Public Counsel 9 would have the rate increased from \$350,000 per year to \$545,535. 10 11 WHAT IF THE COMMISSION DETERMINES THAT MSD SHOULD BE CHARGED 12 Q. SOMETHING DIFFERENT THAN IT IS CURRENTLY BEING CHARGED FOR 13 THESE SERVICES? 14 If the Commission believes that the MSD contract rate is inappropriate, it should 15 Α. indicate that to be the case, but should make no adjustment to revenue requirement 16 in this case. The contractual amount established and currently being paid is 17 appropriately included in the revenue requirement request in this case. The contract 18 rate can only be changed in conjunction with the Company's next rate case. Of 19 course, MSD would also have the option not to renew the contract. 20 21 WHY DO YOU BELIEVE THAT ADDITIONAL REVENUE SHOULD NOT BE 22 Q. IMPUTED TO MAWC IF THE COMMISSION BELIEVES THE CONTRACT 23 SHOULD BE AMENDED AND THE RATE INCREASED? 24 For many of the same reasons noted in the discussion regarding economic 25 Α.

47

MAWC – DRW Rebuttal

1		development tariffs, there should be no imputation of additional revenue from MSD
2		above the level that is currently being received. The Company entered into this
3		contract only after receiving authority to do so from the Commission, it cannot be
4		amended except through application to the Commission and the contract provides for
5		revenue greater than the cost of providing billing services to MSD, thereby providing
6		benefit to all other St. Louis County customers.
7		
8		15) TANK PAINTING MAINTENANCE TRACKER
9		
10	Q.	ARE TANK PAINTING EXPENSE LEVELS AT ISSUE IN THIS PROCEEDING?
11	A.	Not at this time. Tank painting maintenance will be trued up as of April 30, 2010, and
12		it will be determined at that time whether there is a disagreement among the parties.
13		
14	Q.	IS IT CORRECT, HOWEVER, THAT THE TANK PAINTING TRACKER
15		MECHANISM IS AT ISSUE?
16	Α.	I do not believe that the establishment of a regulatory asset or liability in accordance
17		with the past settlement agreements are at issue. Neither is the amortization period
18		for that regulatory asset or liability. There is disagreement between Staff and the
19		Company as to whether the tracker mechanism should be continued on a going
20		forward basis.
21		
22	Q.	WILL THE COMMISSION'S DECISION ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE
23		TRACKER IMPACT THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT DETERMINATION IN THIS
24		CASE?
25	A.	No, it will not.

1		
2	Q.	ARE THERE OTHER TRACKER MECHANISMS IN PLACE FOR MAWC?
3	A.	Yes. Trackers also exist for MAWC employees' pension expense and post-
4		retirement medical benefits.
5		
6	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
7	A.	Yes, it does.
8		

ŧ

Missouri-American Water Company

2009	38,648.01	48,397.61	87045.62	44.4%	55.6%
2008	69,457.31	94,030.95	163488.26	42.5%	57.5%
2007	81,863.21	100,476.87	182340.08	44.9%	55.1%
2006	79,269.63	83,193.01	162462.64	48.8%	51.2%
2005	63,708.19	65,686.72	129394.91	49.2%	50.8%
2004	47,286.56	58,466.06	105752.62	44.7%	55.3%
2003	58,177.27	45,619.24	103796.51	56.0%	44.0%
2002	68,560.40	44,196.07	112756.47	60.8%	39.2%
2001	92192.86 76,609.41	22258.94 35,575.99 44,196.07	114451.8 112185.4 112756.47	68.3%	31.7%
2000	92192.86	22258.94	114451.8	80.6%	19.4%
	O & M OT hrs	Cap & Other OT hrs	Total ·	0 & M 0T	Cap & Other OT



Numbers utilized in Staff overtime adjustment

 \star

	6			AMERICAN WATER
		JOB DESCRIPT	ION	
Job Title: M	gr Govt & Regulat	tory Affairs	Job C	ode: <u>450902</u>
	Grade: <u>L07</u>	FLSA: <u>Exempt</u>	EEO: <u>1. Of</u>	ficials and Managers
Salary Plan:	Level:		(*)	· · · · · ·
Reports To:	Regional Extern	al Affairs Director		š. ".
itatus: Active	Appro	oved: 2 3/3/2004	Revise	d: 🗆
regulators and e	Improve business o external opinion forr holder goals and ot	climate for the Company th mers. Influence at state le ojectives.	rough positive intera vel to promote initiat	ictions with legislators an ives that support Compar
	Key	Accountabilities		Percentage of Time
Jnderstand and egislative issue		pelling way the Company	position on key	10
	ence legislative pro Company goals and	grams and other critical bu objectives.	usiness issues in	10
	nd local level and in	with elected and appointe vest considerable time and		10
employees, put	olic officials, etc.) to	in be cascaded to key stak communicate pertinent is iness change, etc.)		10
	nanagement relativ hich impact on the	e to pertinent legislative is business.	sues and other	10
		ndustry, trade or consumer nefit our stakeholders.	groups to	10
Education: B.S. Degree, preferably in Communications, Political Science, Business Administration.				
Skills: Strong verbal and written communication skills, Strong interpersonal skills. Sophisticated influencing skills, personal network, and ability to gain access to decision makers and opinion formers.				
Knowledge: Knowledge of water industry issues and trends. Good knowledge of local and state legislative and political				

\star	•
AMERICAN	WATER

ar a	functioning. Broad business knowled	lge (operatio	nal, financial, regulatory)			
Scope: (Minimum)	Total Supervised: Exem	npt	Non-Exempt:			
• •	Direct Budget:	<u>\$0.00</u>	Indirect Budget:	<u>\$0.00</u>		
	Direct Revenue:	<u>\$0.00</u>	Indirect Revenue:	<u>\$0.00</u>		
Experience:	Undetermined	_				
Certifications & Licenses:	Undetermined			2		
Work Environment:	Undetermined	+				
Travel Requirements:	Undetermined					
Key Interfaces:	local level, regulators, b	Employees, elected and appointed public officials at federal, state and local level, regulators, business leaders, chambers of commerce, economic development councils, special interest groups.				
economic development councils, special interest gro Other: Key Accountabilities (cont.): Track and monitor legislative bills and trends which on our current business. Support our business development projects as requipotential new business leads to developers. Build knowledge and skills (external communication with the Senior Management team to build their cap Contribute to effective communication by listening a constructive feedback; supporting the creation of an work environment; cascading and sharing knowledge relevant to other members of the team and colleague business. (40%)		rojects as required and p lopers. communication and influ build their capabilities. n by listening and provid creation of an open and aring knowledge and info	provide lence) ing d honest prmation			

Region & SSC\Active\Approved: 2/19/2002

			American Water
		JOB DESCRIPTIO	N
Job Title: N	lgr Ext Affairs (State)		Job Code: <u>450391</u>
a	Grade: <u>L07</u>	FLSA: <u>Exempt</u>	EEO: <u>1.2 First/Mid Level Officials a</u>
Salary Plan:	Level:	3	
Reports To:	Dir Comm & EA (Sta	te)	
Status: Active	Approved	: <u>10/31/2007</u>	Revised:

Primary role: The primary role of this position is to provide senior-level communications counsel to the state president and the state senior management team and to develop, coordinate, implement and manage all external communications activities to support the success of the state business plan and operating objectives. The primary areas of responsibility include media relations, public relations, community relations, corporate social responsibility and local support to government relations activities and meeting the information needs of customers. This professional is poised to respond rapidly and tactically to unanticipated events and critical issues such as main breaks and other critical incidents, and is equally focused on providing proactive and strategic communications counsel and advise to the state senior management team. This role is focused on anticipating and managing local communications issues and effectively positioning the company with key opinion leaders and key constituencies.

The External Affairs Manager is the critical communications resource maximizing the company's communications effectiveness, flexibility and responsiveness within the communities we serve. This professional has a comprehensive depth of communications knowledge and experience with demonstrated expertise in implementing integrated, strategic communications programs. While not directly responsible for customer communications or internal communication, the External Affairs Manager is an active and vital component of an integrated communications team operating through a matrix management model that is responsible for functional excellence reaching all audiences with a full array of internal and external communications messages, tactics and activities.

This role is responsible for identifying, developing, nurturing and sustaining strong and enduring relationships with the media not only during unanticipated events but also to proactively to leverage media coverage. This function ensures that American Water is aligned with key community groups and organizations and well regarded and respected as a "good corporate citizen". Leads and directs all communications activities to reflect American Water's commitment to its customers and communities. Working closely with the State President and the state senior management team, the manager ensures that the company is effectively aligned and positioned to develop and sustain key relationships with community leaders, government and regulatory authorities, as well as elected and appointed officials.

The External Affairs Manager will report to the Director of Communications and External Affairs and indirectly to the State President and to the Director of External Affairs at corporate.

×

Key Accountabilities	Percentage of Time
Directly supports the strategic communications needs of a state and the state senior management team. Provides senior-level communications counsel and ensures the effective implementation of external affairs and related communications activities. Assists in strategy development and the proactive development of communications materials/tactics that produce cost, time and resource efficiencies across the business as well as ensures consistent messaging for all audiences. Ensures wise budget management. Works directly and closely with the State President to equip the state management team to develop and sustain key relationships - with community leaders, the media, elected/appointed officials, regulators and their staff members, and to manage and advance important communications objectives to these target constituencies. Employs a keen awareness and knowledge of community. Implements communications strategies, tactics and activities to ensure ongoing, consistent and targeted communications before, during and after rate case filings.	20
Develops, manages and directs comprehensive strategic communications plans and supporting materials for public communications including media relations, conference participation, community relations/events, local government relations and sponsorship/memberships and executes in a proactive manner. Interacts and provides communications counsel on communications-related issues, challenges and opportunities. Develops effective crisis plans, crisis communications and serves as a spokesperson in a crisis situation. Is highly effective when developing messages for American Water during a crisis.	20
Effectively manages internal and external resources, such as public relations agencies and other communications consultants, and adheres to all budget management requirements.	
Monitors internal/external business developments, as well as identifies connections between business activities and industry trends, that may pose a threat or benefit to the company's reputation. Works closely with the Customer Communications Manager, the Internal Communications Manager and the Customer Service Center Communications Manager to ensure that materials are anticipated, planned for and developed on a timely basis to meet the needs of state operations. Provides communications support to business development activities, when needed.	-
Effectively establishes and maintains relationships with key media outlets and educates the media on issues of interest to American Water.	35
Develops, executes and measures the effectiveness of media relations strategies in support of the state's capital investment program. Predicts and anticipates the needs of the news media/reporters and is cognizant of meeting these needs. Plans and manages large press and community events.	3

Region & SSC\Active\Approved: 2/19/2002

*	
SUBKAN	WATER

λ

Develops talking points and cor media, media pitching and coad management team on how to c with the media (during an interv meeting) or when speaking befile aders, or other target audience	* *				
Works collaboratively to develo lines. Develops plans that antic plans and oversees implementa support of the company's Corpo with state and corporate legal to language is in all materials.	15				
professionals supporting the sta Manager, the Internal Commun Communications and External / Communications Manager and corporate to ensure communicat Regularly communicates and di communications positions. Wor ensure the effective strategic al	Works closely, collaboratively and seamlessly with peer communications professionals supporting the state including Customer Communications Manager, the Internal Communications Manager, the Director of Communications and External Affairs, the Customer Service Center Communications Manager and the entire Corporate Communications team in corporate to ensure communication integration and maximum effectiveness. Regularly communicates and discusses best practices with peer communications positions. Works in a seamless and integrated manner to ensure the effective strategic alignment and coordination of all communications, both internal and external, within each state and between				
communications counsel, suppo	vernment relations lead to provide ort and all necessary materials. Interfaces with ops and sustains strong working relationships	10			
Undetermined		0			
Education:	Bachelor's degree in journalism, communica English, advertising or related field preferred experienced commensurate with the require	d, or demonstrated			
Skills: Region & SSC\Active\Approved: 2/19/2002	 Proactively provides senior-level strategic communications counsel to State President and other members of the state senior management team. Advises and manages crisis communications issues to minimize brand and reputation damage. Experienced serving as a spokesperson under normal and crisis situations. Compelling and effective public speaker and spokesperson. Has an unrelenting customer and market focus. Is a highly accomplished writer. Develops effective talking points for State Presidents and state senior management teams; Develops and writes effective press releases; researches and develops white papers; supports the speech writing needs for the State President and other 				

AMURR AN WALLR

state senior management team members; drafts complex proposals; develops compelling PowerPoint presentations.

Works effectively and productively in a matrix environment.

Able to work as part of an integrated team supporting the communications needs of the entire company within the state, while interfacing effectively with all departments within corporate communications

Able to effectively influence, analyze, persuade and problem solve.

Proven ability to operate with cross-cultural sensitivity and ability to maintain the highest of ethical standards.

Possesses creativity, initiative, good judgment, and the ability to communicate thoughts clearly and simply.

Shows empathy for the community and employee needs, while recognizing company resource limitations.

Self-confident and an enthusiasm for motivating people with excellent relationship-building skills and savvy.

Flexible and adaptable to recognize others views and work in varied environments.

Strong influencing and persuasion skills to work with senior management team, and an ability to effectively communicate with diverse employee and community populations.

Self-motivated professional who can succeed both autonomously and as part of a team with an ability to establish credibility and support the organization's preferences and priorities.

Ability to deal with ambiguity and effectively manage multiple projects at one time and during an emergency situation.

Has a thorough knowledge of strategic communications. Extensive experience in developing, implementing and measuring all related tactics and activities in support of effective integrated communications strategies.

Displays a thorough knowledge and understanding of the media and the ability to assess a reporter's focus/beat. Is highly adept at developing and placing media materials including press releases, letters to the editor, and op-eds. Confident and experienced in arranging and conducting editorial boards.

Possesses strong written and verbal communication skills.

Is knowledgeable of community-based organizations, the political

Region & SSC\Active\Approved: 2/19/2002

Knowledge:

*
AMERICAN WALER

			AMURICAN WAT	1.15
	background and agend initiatives. Understands knowledgeable about th	s local and stat	te political issues and is	
8 	Understands Reg FD d traded companies and and non-material inform	understands th	rements pertaining to pu le difference between m	ublicly- aterial
2	Demonstrated ability to materials while achievir			ality
	Demonstrated ability to task and meet strict dea		re-prioritize quickly. Abil	ity to mult
	Has excellent and effici Excel and Access data		owledge of PowerPoint	, Word,
*	Is familiar with project r managing vendors and			4
	Has experience plannin hospitality events.	ng and execution	ng trade show and client	t
Scope: (Minimum)	Total Supervised: Exer	mpt <u>1</u>	Non-Exempt:	<u>0</u>
	Direct Budget:	<u>\$0.00</u>	Indirect Budget:	\$0.00
20	Direct Revenue:	<u>\$0.00</u>	Indirect Revenue:	\$0.00
Experience:	Seven to ten years of e media reporting, marke corporate and/or agenc	ting and comn	nunity relations in a fast-	
Certifications & Licenses:	Undetermined			
Work Environment:	Located in a state supp communications needs	orting the full a of the compar	array of external affairs ny's operations within th	and at state.
Travel Requirements:	20% within the state an	nd in the United	States	
Key Interfaces:	Customer Communica Managers, Governmen Communications Mana	ector of Comm tions Manager t Relations Ma ger, Corporate al Affairs Depa Senior Manage	nunications and Externa s, Internal Communicati nager, Customer Servic communications Depa rtment), Business Deve ement. External	l Affairs, ions e Center irtment
Other:	Area 1 (NJ/NY/PA/OH) Area 2 (KY/TN/VA/WV/ Area 3 (MO/IL/IN/IA/MI Area 4 (CA/AZ/HI/NM/	5.9 M /MD 1.8 M 4.7 M	o Svd Communs Svd 668 342 432 120	Emps 2999 586 2341 576

Region & SSC\Active\Approved: 2/19/2002



Direct Budget: AVG 1 - 4 1(NJ/NY/PA/OH) \$508K 2(KY/TN/VA/WV/MD \$300K 3(MO/IL/IN/IA/MI \$337K 4(CA/AZ/HI/NM/TX/WA \$1.0M

Direct Revenue: AVG 1 - 4 1(NJ/NY/PA/OH) \$112M 2(KY/TN/VA/WV/MD \$59M 3(MO/IL/IN/IA/MI \$132M 4(CA/AZ/HI/NM/TX/WA \$83M

Region & SSC\Active\Approved: 2/19/2002

2 ×

★

			0	AMERICAN WATER
		JOB DESCRIPTION		
Job Title: Sr	Mgr Business Dev		Job	Code: <u>552708</u>
6 X.	Grade: <u>L06</u>	FLSA: Exempt	EEO: <u>1.2 F</u>	First/Mid Level Officials a
Salary Plan:	Level:		5	
Reports To:	State President/Dir Bu	ıs Dev (Div/Region)		.97
Status Active	Approved:	10/31/2007	Revise	ed: 🗆 .
management pro updating the Reg	cess in the allocated ter gional business developn	nd secure suitable new bu ritory and support the Dire nent plan and implementin ne company's business pl	ector Business ng the plan to	Developer in developing, secure profitable and
	Кеу Ассо	untabilities		Percentage of Time
maintain a stead Identify, qualify a market data and	y flow of projects and se ind prioritize leads throug active targeted prospect	and target opportunities to cure those within plan tim gh the use of appropriate ing; Negotiate and close o and which contribute to bu	escales, tools, local deals in line	40
offerings with cus		nities and match service a service offerings to create stomer needs.		25
manage the busi commercial oper offerings; Identify	ness development proce ation for major contract s / creative approaches to	ment cycle; Effectively pr ss from deal structuring to services, tuck-ins and sen developing & structuring nt needs & support busing	hrough to vice new	15
Lead the develop and credit assess Division/Regiona and manage cros assess, develop	sment of opportunities an I/Corporate investment a ss functional and Region	, deal structuring, project nd champion projects thro ppraisal process; Identify al resources to help evalu elop implementation plans s to deliver the deal.	ough the , secure late, risk	10
	an Water brand image wi	American Water, and dev th the key industry stake		5

Region & SSC\Active\Approved: 2/19/2002

8		AMERICAN WAT	ER
through the development of the	documentation from the qualification process project & contract negotiation history data and le relevant databases in order to enable ional teams.		18
Education:	Bachelor Degree required.		
Skills:	Strong team management & communicati Ability to follow-through, converting long to adding deals Highly developed relationship manageme Ability to follow-through, converting long to adding deals Project, bid structuring & negotiation skills High levels of integrity and ability to opera company frameworks	erm relationships int nt & communication erm relationships int s.	skills o value
Knowledge:	Water and wastewater utility infrastructure Strong financial and commercial acumen.		
Scope: (Minimum)	Total Supervised: Exempt 5	Non-Exempt:	<u>0</u>
	Direct Budget: <u>\$0.00</u>	Indirect Budget:	<u>\$0.00</u>
	Direct Revenue <u>\$0.00</u> Ir	ndirect Revenue:	<u>\$0.00</u>
Experience:	Accomplished business developer with a resperience and a proven track record of s waste water utility services in the regulate	uccess in the water	and
Certifications & Licenses:	Undetermined		
Work Environment:	Office	4	
Travel Requirements:	40%		
Key Interfaces:	State President (Regulated BD) and state Division/Regional Business Development Bid support team State and Corporate functional experts: O Business Developers within & across the SVP, Sales and Business Development External Affairs (Marketing Communicatio AWE VP Business Development	Director perations, HR, Lega Division/Region	II, Finance
Other:	 Combines two current jobs Client Exect Developer (#550802). Depending on a State's business developed the "client executive" or "business developed may be emphasized. The title of Director can be used for ext 	opment strategy/opp per" aspects of this p	oortunities
×	Total Supervised: Exempt 2-8 (Deal Tear	n)	1.7

Region & SSC\Active\Approved: 2/19/2002

Schedule DRW-5

Missouri American Water Company Belleville Labs - Five Year Review Summary of Test Analysis by Operating Company Showing % Min and Max of Test Analyses

State	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Min	Max	% Var
Arizona	5.52%	6.06%	4.29%	5.59%	6.88%	4.29%	6.88%	60.37%
California	15.89%	17.86%	11.48%	14.46%	19.13%	11.48%	19.13%	66.67%
lowa	0.64%	0.88%	0.69%	0.51%	0.66%	0.51%	0.88%	73.45%
Illinois	9.96%	6.31%	5.87%	7.37%	5.73%	5.73%	9.96%	73.78%
Indiana	4.57%	3.78%	7.33%	6.85%	7.52%	3.78%	7.52%	99.02%
Kentucky	1.33%	1.64%	1.65%	4.07%	1.89%	1.33%	4.07%	204.74%
Maryland	0.49%	0.32%	0.31%	0.29%	0.21%	0.21%	0.49%	134.29%
Michigan	0.15%	0.07%	0.05%	0.21%	0.10%	0.05%	0.21%	310.83%
Missouri	6.40%	6.04%	6.02%	5.51%	4.63%	4.63%	6.40%	38.14%
New Jersey	33.27%	34.89%	33.06%	34.13%	33.48%	33.06%	34.89%	5.54%
New Mexico	0.03%	0.42%	0.25%	0.60%	0.23%	0.03%	0.60%	1800.90%
New York	1.78%	2.21%	2.04%	1.82%	1.56%	1.56%	2.21%	41.95%
Ohio	2.22%	1.93%	4.15%	3.53%	2.93%	1.93%	4.15%	115.32%
Pennsylvania	11.45%	11.70%	15.06%	9.44%	11.21%	9.44%	15.06%	59.53%
Puerto Rico	0.75%	0.93%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.93%	
Tennessee	1.14%	1.05%	1.50%	1.12%	1.99%	1.05%	1.99%	89.18%
Texas	0.00%	0.03%	0.08%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	0.08%	
Virginia	1.74%	1.18%	3.35%	1.84%	1.84%	1.18%	3.35%	184.89%
West Virginia	2.68%	2.70%	2.82%	2.65%	%00.0	0.00%	2.82%	
Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%			