

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of RDE Water Company's,)
Tariff Designed to Increase Rates)
for Water Service Pursuant to the)
Commission's Informal Rate Procedure) Case No. WR-2000-416

ORDER ESTABLISHING PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

Pursuant to the informal rate procedure of the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission), RDE Water Company (RDE) filed a proposed tariff on January 12, 2000, designed to increase the total annual revenue for water service by \$6185, with the tariff to go into effect on March 1, 2000.

On February 14, 2000, Familia Limited Partnership d/b/a English Village Mobile Home (English Village) filed its application to intervene and its motion to suspend the tariff.

On February 18, 2000, the Staff of the Commission (Staff) filed its recommendation. Staff recommended that the Commission approve the tariff filed on January 10, 2000, by RDE for service rendered on and after March 1, 2000.

On February 22, 2000, English Village filed an "amendment" to its application to intervene and motion to suspend. In the pleading, which is actually a supplement rather than an amendment, English Village stated that its second pleading sought to clarify the issues in which it is

interested so that RDE is not unfairly or unnecessarily affected by a suspension of tariffs.

On February 29, 2000, the Commission entered its order granting English Village intervention, ordering the parties to file a proposed procedural schedule no later than March 20, 2000, and ordering all proposed tariff sheets submitted on January 12, 2000, by RDE be suspended until June 29, 2000.

On March 20, 2000, Staff filed a joint proposed procedural schedule which stated that all the parties had agreed to the suggested dates. However, the Commission finds that the dates set forth in the proposed procedural schedule will not permit sufficient time for all the necessary procedural steps to be completed before the operation of law date on June 29, 2000. For example, the parties proposed an evidentiary hearing on June 1 and 2, 2000. The transcripts for such a hearing would normally be available, at the earliest, around June 15, 2000. The parties would then desire time for the filings of initial and rebuttal briefs, which normally takes more than ten (10) days. Even expediting the filing of the transcript would not allow sufficient time for the parties to submit briefs and the Commission to reach a decision. Thus, it is apparent that the proposed procedural schedule is not workable.

The Commission will establish a procedural schedule.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That the following procedural schedule is established for this case:

| | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| Prehearing Conference | - | March 29, 2000 10:00 AM |
| Direct Testimony of all parties | - | April 6, 2000 3:00 PM |
| Rebuttal Testimony of all parties | - | April 20, 2000 3:00 PM |
| Surrebuttal Testimony of all parties | - | April 27, 2000 3:00 PM |
| List of issues; order of witnesses and cross examination | - | May 1, 2000 3:00 PM |
| Statement of the position of each party on each issue | - | May 2, 2000 3:00 PM |
| Evidentiary Hearing | - | May 9 & 10, 2000 9:00 AM each day |

2. That this order shall become effective on April 3, 2000.

BY THE COMMISSION



**Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge**

(S E A L)

Bill Hopkins, Senior Regulatory Law Judge,
by delegation of authority pursuant to
4 CSR 240-2.120(1), (November 30, 1995)
and Section 386.240, RSMo 1994.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 22nd day of March, 2000.