BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the General Rate Increase for Water and Sewer Service Provided)	Case No. WR-2007-0216
)	
by Missouri-American Water Company.)	SR-2007-0217

MOTION TO STRIKE THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ALAN RATERMANN

COMES NOW Missouri-American Water Company (MAWC or Company), and, as its Motion to Strike the Rebuttal Testimony of Alan Ratermann, states as follows to the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission):

- 1. On July 13, 2007, the Utility Workers Union of America, Local 335 (UWUA Local 335) filed the Rebuttal Testimony of Alan Ratermann. On July 31, 2007, UWUA Local 335 filed its Motion for Leave to Refile Testimony wherein it asked for permission to late-file two exhibits that were not filed with Mr. Ratermann's testimony.
- 2. Mr. Ratermann states that the purpose of his Rebuttal Testimony is to express his concern with the "health and safety of consumers and employees" of MAWC "and insuring that adequate funds from the requested rate increase are allocated to address these health and safety issues." Specifically, Mr. Ratermann focuses his comments on asbestos-cement pipe removal issues.
- 3. Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.130(7)(B) states that "where all parties file direct testimony, rebuttal testimony shall include all testimony which is responsive to the testimony and exhibits contained in any other party's direct testimony."
- 4. In addition to being of questionable relevance to this rate making proceeding, Mr. Ratermann's Rebuttal Testimony violates Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.130(7)(B) in that it

fails to respond to the direct testimony of any party. In fact, the testimony does not even claim to respond to the direct testimony of any person or party. The Rebuttal Testimony represents a unorthodox new proposal for revenue allocation to a future pipe replacement program and attempts to interject this new issue into the proceeding at the rebuttal stage.

- 5. Not only did Mr. Ratermann fail to raise this issue in direct testimony, Mr. Ratermann failed to raise this issue when he testified before the Commission at a local public hearing in this case on June 13, 2007, in Kirkwood. Tr. Vol. 9, p. 9-11. Having failed to raise this issue in direct testimony, as a party is required to do by Commission rule, and having failed to raise this issue in his oral testimony, Mr. Ratermann should not now be given a third opportunity.
- 6. The purpose of providing prefiled testimony is to give parties notice of the claims, contentions and evidence in issue. MAWC filed its direct testimony with the initiation of this case on December 15, 2006. Other parties filed their direct testimony on June 5 and 12, 2007. Instead of filing at that time, UWUA Local 335 waited until July 13, 2007, to file this testimony, only two weeks prior to the required filing of surrebuttal testimony.
- 7. Such timing prejudices MAWC's ability to respond in that there only limited opportunity to conduct discovery and reply to this new issue. Accordingly, MAWC asks the Commission to strike Mr. Ratermann's Rebuttal Testimony prior to the hearing of this matter.
- 8. In the alternative to this motion to strike, MAWC has quickly prepared and filed the surrebuttal testimony of Cindy Hebenstreit and Greg Weeks in an attempt to address the UWUA Local 335 issues. However, if MAWC's motion is sustained, there will be no need to offer Ms. Hebenstreit's and Mr. Weeks' surrbeuttal testimony.

WHEREFORE, MAWC respectfully requests that the Commission sustain this motion and strike the Rebuttal Testimony of Alan Ratermann.

Respectfully submitted,

D1.Com

William R. England, III

MBE#23975

Dean L. Cooper

Mo. Bar 36592

BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C.

312 East Capitol Avenue

P.O. Box 456

Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456

Telephone: (573) 635-7166 Facsimile: (573) 635-0427

 $\underline{trip@brydonlaw.com}$

dcooper@brydonlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been sent by electronic mail this 31st day of July, 2007, to:

Kevin Thompson Christina Baker

General Counsel's Office Office of the Public Counsel
Kevin.Thompson@psc.mo.gov christina.baker@ded.mo.gov

Michael A. Evans Marc H. Ellinger

Hammond, Shinners, et al. Blitz, Bardgett & Deutsch <u>mevans@hstly.com</u> <u>MEllinger@blitzbardgett.com</u>

Stuart Conrad Lisa C. Langeneckert Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson The Stolar Partnership

stucon@fcplaw.com llangeneckert@stolarlaw.com

Leland B. Curtis James M. Fischer Curtis, Heinz, et al. Fischer & Dority lcurtis@lawfirmemail.com ifischerpc@aol.com

William D. Steinmeier Diana M. Vuylsteke William D. Steinmeier, P.C. Bryan Cave, L.L.P.

wds@wdspc.com dmvuylsteke@bryancave.com

Byron E. Francis Mark W. Comley
Armstrong Teasdale LLP Newman, Comley & Ruth
bfrancis@armstrongteasdale.com comleym@ncrpc.com

Jeremiah Finnegan Robert L. Hess II
Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson Husch & Eppenberger

jfinnegan@fcplaw.com robert.hess@husch.com

Dean L. Cooper

016