Exhibit No.:

Issues: Operations, Quality of Service,

Construction Projects, Rate Adjustment, Plant in Service

Witness: Jan

James A. Merciel, Jr.

Sponsoring Party:

MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit:

Direct Testimony WR-2007-0216

FILED August 27, 2007

Case No.: WR-2007-0216
Date Testimony Prepared: June 05, 2007

Data Center

Missouri Public Service Commision

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

JAMES A. MERCIEL, JR.

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

CASE NO. WR-2007-0216, et al.

Case No(s).

Jefferson City, Missouri June 2007

STAFF-15

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Missouri-American Water Company's request for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase for Water Service provided in Missouri Service Areas) Case No. WR-2007-0216)
•	
AFFIDAVIT OF JA	MES A. MERCIEL, JR.
STATE OF MISSOURI)	
COUNTY OF COLE)	
the following Direct Testimony, in question and in the above case; that the answers in the follow knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers knowledge and belief.	In states: that he has participated in the preparation of d answer form, consisting of 6 pages, to be presented ving Direct Testimony were given by him, that he has wers; and that such answers are true to the best of his James A. Merciel, Jr.
Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4 th da	y of June 2007.
Notary Public My commission expires 07-01-200	D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri County of Cole My Commission Exp. 07/01/2008

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF 2 3 JAMES A. MERCIEL, JR. MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY 5 CASE NO. WR-2007-0216, et al. 6 7 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY....... GENERAL OPERATIONS AND QUALITY OF SERVICE......2 8 9 RATE ADJUSTMENTS FOR PLANT IN SERVICE 4

10

11

1		DIRECT TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		JAMES A. MERCIEL, JR.
4		MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
5		CASE NO. WR-2007-0216, et al.
6	INTRODUCT	<u>ION</u>
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
8	Α.	James A. Merciel, Jr., P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.
9	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
10	A.	I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission")
11	as a Utility Regulatory Engineering Supervisor, in the Water and Sewer Department ("W/S	
12	Department").	
13	Q.	Please describe your education and work experience.
14	A.	I graduated from the University of Missouri at Rolla in 1976 with a Bachelor
15	of Science deg	ree in Civil Engineering. I am a Registered Professional Engineer in the State
16	of Missouri. I	worked for a construction company in 1976 as an engineer and surveyor, and
17	have worked fo	or the Commission in the W/S Department since 1977.
18	<u>EXECUTIVE</u>	SUMMARY
19	Q.	What is the purpose of your Direct testimony?
20	A.	To present testimony regarding quality of service, system operations and new
21	construction.	

2

3

4 5

7

8

6

9 10

12

11

14

13

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

GENERAL OPERATIONS AND QUALITY OF SERVICE

- Q. Are you familiar with the Company's overall operation of its water systems and its sewer systems?
- A. Yes. Inspections of the Company's systems are periodically conducted by individuals from the W/S Department who are under my direct supervision and/or by me. The W/S Department Staff conducts such inspections to evaluate the conditions of the Company's facilities, to evaluate the Company's operation of the facilities and to review the various records that the Company maintains about its system operations. The Company has programs such as valve exercising, meter replacements, hydrant exercising and flushing, pump maintenance, and leak detection. Records are maintained for these programs, as are operational records pertaining to plant performance, water quality and characteristics, volume of water pumped, and storage tank levels. All of these programs and records contribute toward providing quality water and sewer service.
 - Q. Does the Company have any customer service issues?
- A. I believe that the Company is addressing, or has already addressed, significant recurring customer service issues. One of the most notable issues involves the Warren County service area, which the Company acquired from a regulated utility that was in receivership. For several years, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the Warren County health department, overseeing homebuilding permits, have had a prohibition on new construction due to inadequate sewage treatment capacity. After some effort, and cost, additional sewage treatment capacity is now in place at both facility locations in this service area. The cost of expanding sewage treatment capacity is an issue within this case as well as a tariff filing the Company has proposed with regard to charges to new customers making new service connections.

1 | 2 | lea | 3 | ov | 4 | fo | 5 | thi | 6 | iss | 7 | wi | 8 | lo | 9 | Ro

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Many of the complaints and inquiries the Staff gets involving the Company pertain to leaks in the St. Louis County service area. Individual complaints might involve a customerowned service line, a very small leak that is visible to the customer but not a high priority job for the Company, or occasionally a matter that indeed does need attention. I don't consider this to be a new issue or an increasing problem, in that leaks and main breaks have been an issue for a number of years, and will always continue to be an issue that this and many other water utilities will need to pursue. I believe that the Company is managing this issue on a long term basis by replacing its poorest quality pipelines, and using the Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge or "ISRS."

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

- Q. Are there major plant items that have been recently constructed in any of the Company's service areas?
- A. Yes, there are several projects that substantially impact rates. Besides the aforementioned Warren County sewage treatment facilities, the Company constructed a water storage tank in that same area in order to address water pressure and storage needs.

Also, another sewage treatment facility is being expanded. It is referred to as the Sand Creek facility, and is one of two plants in the Company's Cedar Hill service area in Jefferson County. However, that facility is being constructed entirely for future customer growth.

Finally, the water plant facilities in the Joplin service area are undergoing major rehabilitation, replacement and expansion. Of an approximately \$44 million project, the Company has spent approximately \$10 million placing a new river intake into service. This new intake increases reliability from several aspects, and has increased capacity for the

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

expanded treatment plant capacity that is a part of the rehabilitation and replacement project at the plant site.

Do you believe these new facilities are reasonable and necessary? Q.

A. Yes. The Warren County projects are vital for existing customers, for property owners who were prohibited from building new homes, and for future growth. The Joplin and Cedar Hill facilities are necessary for increasing capacity due to growth, and in the case of Joplin also due to aging of existing facilities. Although the sewage treatment facilities seem to be rather expensive plants, the Company accepted the best bids, and I believe the Company has prudently planned and carried out these projects.

RATE ADJUSTMENTS FOR PLANT IN SERVICE

Q. Do you believe that the entire capital amount of plant projects should be included in rate calculations for this case?

A. No. I believe that there should be a plant capacity adjustment for the Warren County service area, specifically for the water storage tank and the two new sewage treatment facilities; and also for the Cedar Hill Sand Creek sewage treatment facility expansion. The reasons for this are that the plant expansions are quite massive in relation to existing plant, and that the expansions are mostly intended to serve future customers.

Of these projects, only the Warren County storage tank is included in the 2006 test year. All of the sewage treatment plant projects were or will be placed in service in 2007, and need not be addressed until True-Up.

- Q. What specific adjustments you are recommending?
- A, The adjustment to plant for the 200,000 gallon Warren County Storage Tank, in my opinion, should be 70% of its cost, based on current average-day water usage of 88,000

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

gallons, and the fact that the existing storage tank is in use as a ground storage tank with electric pumps.

- Q. For True-Up, I believe that 60% of the Warren County sewage treatment facilities should be adjusted out of current rate base, the other 40% representing capacity that is necessary for existing customers. The entire amount of the Cedar Hill Sand Creek facility should be adjusted out of current rate base since this plant is necessary only for future customers.
- Is this plant capacity adjustment intended to deny the Company a return "of Q. and on" its investment in the subject facilities?
- A. No, it is not intended to disallow plant levels from rate base on a permanent or any long-term basis, nor to deny any revenue except that which would otherwise be paid by existing customers for plant that is needed in the future. The only purpose of this proposed plant capacity adjustment is to postpone collection of revenue until the expected new customers are connected. Since many of these new customers could connect within the next year or two, not making this adjustment could result in over-collections and over-earnings, and also would add to an already substantial rate impact upon some existing customers.
- Q. Do the Company's tariff filings that are being addressed in Case No. ST-2007-0443 present any impact upon these proposed plant adjustments?
- A. No. Whether or not the tariff filings are addressed in the context of this rate case, the Contribution-in-aid-of-Construction charges, or CIAC, proposed in those tariff filings, which would be paid by new customers upon application to connect to the sewer systems, have no impact upon current expenses, current rate base, or current plant capacity

Direct Testimony of James A. Merciel, Jr.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

usage levels. The collection of the proposed CIAC charges would only impact future rate

base as additional customers connect, with that impact being a reduction to rate base.

SUMMARY

Q. Would you please summarize your testimony?

A. Yes. It is my opinion that the Company is providing quality service from a technical standpoint to its customers, is adequately operating and maintaining its existing plant facilities and is adequately planning for facility improvements and future needs. It is also my opinion that the new capital improvement projects that the Company is seeking to include in rates through this case are reasonable and appropriate, except that from a practical standpoint adjustments are needed for the major capital improvements in the Warren County and Cedar Hill service areas since the projects are massive and are necessary for a substantial amount of customer growth.

- Q. Does this conclude your Direct testimony at this time?
- A. Yes.

Page 6