Exhibit No.:	
Issues:	Tank Painting Tracker Adjustment, Non-Revenue Water Adjustment, Consolidated Tariff Rules, Metering of Large Users in the St. Joseph District, Tariff Provisions for Residential Fire Sprinkler Service
Witness:	Greg A. Weeks
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

GREG A. WEEKS

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 RATES FOR WATER AND SEWER SERVICE	)))))	**CASE NO. WR-2010-0131** **CASE NO. SR-2010-0135**

AFFIDAVIT OF GREG A. WEEKS

Greg A. Weeks, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the witness who sponsors the accompanying testimony entitled "Rebuttal Testimony of Greg A. Weeks"; 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.

Greg A. Weeks

State of Missouri
County of St. Louis
SUBSCRIBED and sworn to
Before me this 14th day of April 2010.

Notary Public

My commission expires:

STACI A. OLSEN
Notary Public – Notary Seal
STATE OF MISSOURI
St. Charles County
Commission Number 09519210
My commission expires March 20, 2013

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF
GREG A.WEEKS

I. WITNESS INTRODUCTION

Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?

A. Greg Weeks, 727 Craig Road, St. Louis, Missouri 63141.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am Vice President of Operations for Missouri-American Water Company ("MAWC" or the "Company").

Q. ARE YOU THE SAME GREG WEEKS THAT PROVIDED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?

A. Yes.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. I will address the following issues which were raised in the Staff Report or Direct Testimony of some of the Intervenors:

- Tank Painting Tracker Adjustment
- Non-Revenue Water Adjustment
- Consolidated Tariff Rules
- Metering of Large Users in the St. Joseph District
- Tariff Provisions for Residential Fire Sprinkler Service

II. TANK PAINTING TRACKER ADJUSTMENT

Q. ON PAGE 3 OF THE STAFF REPORT, STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT IF A TRUE-UP THROUGH APRIL 30, 2010 IS AUTHORIZED BY THE COMMISSION, THE STAFF INTENDS TO TRUE-UP COMPONENTS OF

THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT. ONE SUCH COMPONENT THAT STAFF INTENDS TO TRUE-UP, IS THE TANK PAINTING TRACKER. DOES THE COMPANY AGREE WITH THIS RECOMMENDATION?

A. Yes.

Q. STAFF ALSO PROPOSES TO DISCONTINUE THE TANK PAINTING TRACKER THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN CASE NO. WR-2007-0216 DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS RECOMMENDATION?

A. No. The Company believes the tank painting tracker is an appropriate mechanism to insure that the Company recovers no more and no less than its actual tank painting expense. In fact, not only does the Company propose to continue the tracker but also to increase it from $1,000,000 to $1,600,000 annually.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY THE TANK PAINTING TRACKER LEVEL SHOULD BE INCREASED TO AN ANNUAL LEVEL OF $1,600,000?

A. The Company conducted an analysis of the life expectancies of all of its interior and exterior tank coatings. This involved impacts on coating life expectancies such as type of coating, whether it is an interior or exterior coating, the environments to which these coatings are exposed, the type of surface that is coated (i.e., riveted steel versus welded steel), current coating condition, whether the existing coating would be over-coated or removed or replaced and whether the coating contains lead. This analysis resulted in the assignment of a life expectancy of each coating on each tank in all of the Company's districts. Following this analysis, an estimated price to either overcoat or replace each coating was determined.

The Company utilized this information to calculate the average interior and exterior coating life expectancies and replacement cost. The Company next calculated the average number of interior and exterior painting projects to determine average annual tank painting expense. In 2009 dollars, the

average annual tank painting expense was determined to be approximately $1,600,000.

Q. ON PAGE 46 OF THE STAFF REPORT, THE STAFF STATES, "AS OF OCTOBER 31, 2009 THE TRACKER HAS PRODUCED A REGULATORY LIABILITY OF $833,333." IS THIS AN INDICATOR THAT $1,000,000 IS TOO HIGH OF AN ANNUAL LEVEL FOR THE TRACKER?

A. No. Although $83,333 is accrued monthly ($1,000,000 divided by 12 months), tank painting is a seasonal effort with work primarily done in the spring and fall. There is usually work still being done in the October and November timeframe. For the 12 months ending 10/31/08 the tracker was a regulatory asset of $79,124. For the 12 months ending 10/31/09 MAWC was in the middle of a large tank project that concluded shortly thereafter. As a matter of fact, nearly $600,000 in costs were incurred during the month of November, 2009. For the calendar year of 2009 MAWC's tank painting expense was $1,587,474

Q. ON PAGE 69 OF THE STAFF REPORT, THE STAFF INDICATES THAT A TWO YEAR AVERAGE ANNUALIZED EXPENSE WAS $1,084,842. DOES THIS ACCURATELY REFLECT THE COSTS INCURRED IN 2008 AND 2009?

A. No. As explained previously, during 2009 MAWC undertook a large tank project that concluded in November. Nearly $600,000 in costs were incurred in November that are not reflected in the average referenced in the Staff report.

.

Q. HOW DOES THE TRACKER MECHANISM OPERATE?

A. The tracker was established in order to provide adequate funds for MAWC to undertake the extensive tank paint program I have discussed. To the extent MAWC spends less than the amount of the tracker included in rates (proposed at $1,600,000), the customer is protected by setting up a regulatory liability that will flow back to customers over time. This provides

assurance that the Company will utilize those funds accordingly for the tank painting program. If the Company spends more than the authorized tracker amount, a regulatory asset is established that should be recovered by the Company over time.

Q. WHY IS A TRACKER MECHANISM APPROPRIATE?

A. The seasonal timing of tank painting and variability from year to year of the tanks to be painted makes the tracker a good mechanism to establish average annual expenditures that may not be accurately captured in a calendar or "test" year. With tanks ranging in capacity from 11,000,000 gallons to 50,000 gallons, there can be wide swings in the cost from one year to the next. In addition, in terms of scheduling, tank painting needs to be completed in the spring and fall when weather and water delivery to our customers allows the work to be done. An extended hot and dry fall, for instance, could delay fall tank painting and push it into the following year. Conversely, a cold and wet summer could allow work to proceed deeper into summer. The flexibility required to accommodate these operational constraints can move costs from month to month and thus could impact test year or calendar year analysis.

Q. WHY IS IT IMPORTANT THEN THAT THE AUTHORIZED AMOUNT OF THE TRACKER BE COMMENSURATE WITH THE ANNUAL LEVEL OF EXPENDITURES?

A. The existence of the tracker is important as a protection for both the customer and MAWC. It is intended to act as a balancing mechanism to insure that the costs of the tank painting program and only the costs of that program, are appropriately recovered. If the tracker is set substantially below the level of annual expenditures, however, the regulatory asset will continue to grow from year to year and future customers will be expected to pay for costs that should be borne by existing customers. The converse would be true if actual tank painting were below the tracker level on an ongoing basis. In this case,

we know that both current and future expenditure will exceed the existing tracker base amount of $1,000,000.

Q. WHAT IS THE LEVEL OF TANK PAINTING EXPENSE THE COMPANY HAS INCURRED IN 2009?

A. The Company has incurred $1,587,474, of tank painting expense in 2009.

Q. WHERE DOES THIS FALL WITH RESPECT TO THE CURRENT ANNUAL LEVEL OF THE TANK PAINTING TRACKER?

A. The Company has incurred tank painting expense in 2009, which is in excess of the current tracker by $587,474.

Q. WHAT DOES THIS LEVEL OF TANK PAINTING EXPENSE INCURRED BY THE COMPANY IN 2009 COMBINED WITH THE RESULTS OF THE TANK PAINTING ANALYSIS CONDUCTED BY THE COMPANY INDICATE?

A. The fact that the Company spent $1,587,474 on tank painting in 2009, coupled with its analysis that an optimal level of annual tank painting expense in the future is $1,600,000, provides a strong indication that the Company will conduct tank painting at an annual level of expense equal to the annual level of the proposed tracker (i.e., $1,600,000)..

Q. IN LIGHT OF THE ABOVE DISCUSSION, WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION FOR THE LEVEL OF THE TANK PAINTING TRACKER?

A. I recommend that the tank painting tracker be continued and adjusted to an annual amount of $1,600,000.

III. NON-REVENUE WATER ADJUSTMENT

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON THIS ISSUE?

A. The purpose of this section of my rebuttal testimony is to:

1. Respond to the statements in the Staff Report relating to Staff's pro forma chemical, power, and purchased water expense as they relate to Staff's pro forma adjustment of system delivery for non-revenue (or lost) water.
2. Introduce and describe what is a far more thoughtful, relevant and consistent approach to conducting such evaluations.
3. Apply the approach in item 2 above to the Company's districts and show that these districts all have acceptable water volumes entering their distribution systems beyond that which results in sales.

Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE TO DETERMINE AN APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF NON-REVENUE WATER (NRW)?

A. In this case the Company applied its districts' test year NRW percent values to their pro forma sales volumes to arrive at pro forma system delivery volumes and production expense levels. This would yield an NRW of 18.46% for all districts (Please see Schedule GAW-4, attached).

Q. HOW DOES STAFF PROPOSE THIS ISSUE BE ADDRESSED?

A. In this case the staff applied each district's test year NRW percent values to their respective sales volumes to arrive at pro forma system delivery volumes and production expense levels. This would yield an NRW of 17.33% for all Districts. (Please see Schedule GAW-4, attached).

Q. HOW ARE YOU PROPOSING TO RESOLVE THIS OR DISCREPANCY?

A. In this case, the Company does not object to using a 3 year average of NRW percent values. However, Staff used years 2006 through 2008 and I believe the most current 3 years should be used (i.e., 2007 through 2009). This would yield an NRW of 18.51% (see GAW-4).

Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THIS IS THE BEST WAY FOR THIS ISSUE BE ADDRESSED?

A. No. The Company recommends the application of the Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) performance indicator. This performance indicator is an output of the International Water Association/American Waterworks Association (IWA/AWWA) best practice water audit methodology developed during the period 1997 – 2000. This methodology is also recommended as a best management practice by the AWWA Water Loss Committee and is detailed in the AWWA publication "M36 - Water Audits and Loss Control Programs" 3rd Edition. This methodology features robust performance indicators that allow for an objective gauging of loss levels. The development of this methodology drew on the best practices of the various water auditing approaches used around the world and crafted them into a single, standard best management practice methodology that could be applied across the differing system characteristics. This method advances the concept that all water should be quantified, via measurement or estimate, as either authorized consumption or losses. Hence, no water is "unaccounted-for". The performance indicators, ILI being of primary focus, included in this methodology give a reliable assessment of water loss standing from operational, financial, and water resource management perspectives. They are effective in evaluating current standing, benchmarking with other utilities and loss reduction target setting. Accordingly, as long as the ILI method indicates each district is in an acceptable range, the company would recommend that the actual system delivery should be used rather than using sales volumes and NRW to calculate system delivery.

Q. HAS THE COMPANY COMPLETED WATER AUDITS OF ITS DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS?

A. Yes. A water audit was completed for each of the Company's systems based on 2009 data. Completing these audits also required the Company to develop a water volume accounting spreadsheet that allowed for the quantification of these various volumes by month for each district. From these water volume accounting spreadsheets and the audits, the Company was able to calculate each district's ILI performance indicator.

Q. WHAT WERE THE 2009 ILI VALUES CALCULATED FOR EACH OF THE COMPANY'S DISTRICTS?

A. The Company's 2009 ILI values are listed below.

1.	St. Louis County	2.85
2.	St. Joseph	2.82
3.	Parkville Water	1.16
4.	Warrensburg	2.57
5.	Brunswick	1.69
6.	Mexico	3.90
7.	Joplin	4.13
8.	Jefferson City	2.08
9.	Warren County Water	0.78

Q. WHAT CAN BE CONCLUDED REGARDING THE ACCEPTABILITY OF EACH DISTRICT'S LEVELS OF 2009 ANNUAL REAL LOSSES FROM THE ILI VALUES LISTED ABOVE?

A. Every district has a current ILI value that either falls within or is below (better than) the target range appropriate for it, based on the Company's evaluation of the conditions of each of its districts in the context of the categories of considerations found in the AWWA Water Loss Committee – Leakage Management Target-Setting Guidelines table.

IV. CONSOLIDATED TARIFF RULES

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON THIS ISSUE?

A. My rebuttal testimony will address statements in the direct testimony of the City of St. Joseph witness Bruce Woody.

Q. WHAT TARIFF PROVISIONS IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING TO CONSOLIDATE?

A. As I indicated in my direct testimony, the Company currently has five sets of tariffs that it "inherited" when it acquired various companies. Many of the individual tariff rules and regulations are the same. The Company is proposing to consolidate the tariff rules into one tariff, but the rates for each District will be set forth on separate rate sheets for each District.

Q. MR. WOODY STATES THAT CONSOLIDATED RULES DO NOT BENEFIT THE CUSTOMER OR THE CITY. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS?

A. No. Many of the processes that are covered by these rules are performed in the same way across our multiple districts. The current rules have their genesis with five legacy companies and thus were not ever visualized to be used together. Having one set of rules does "make life easier for MAWC" as Mr. Woody states, but this also benefits the customers. Administering a consolidated tariff should reduce errors that are occasionally made when customers contact the Company. Consolidation of the tariff provisions also allows the rules to better reflect the best practices we are using across the MAWC districts.

Q. DO PARTS OF THESE CONSOLIDATED TARIFFS HAVE A FINANCIAL IMPACT ON ST. JOSEPH?

A. There are three areas addressed in Mr. Woody's testimony; main extensions, customer charges, and miscellaneous fees. The customer charge is more of a rate design issue and not part of the consolidation of the rules. The customer charge issue is addressed in Paul Herbert's testimony. The main extension issue will be addressed in Kevin Dunn's rebuttal testimony.

Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE WITH MISCELLANEOUS FEES?

A. MAWC is proposing that miscellaneous fees be updated to current costs and set at the same rate for all districts. Like consolidation of the rules, this provides consistency that should reduce errors and improve efficiencies.

Q. HOW WERE THESE MISCELLANEOUS FEES DEVELOPED?

A. The process for performing a customer turn-on, a turn-off for non pay, an inspection, etc. is essentially the same across all districts. The orders are generated at the Call Center and dispatched in all districts on the same type of laptop, using the same type of vehicles and tools. The only real difference is the wage rate. To develop the rate, the average cost (weighed by customers) was developed. The weighted average cost was then rounded to an even dollar amount to produce a uniform rate for each activity.

Q. IS THERE ANOTHER PORTION OF MR. WOODY'S TESTIMONY THAT YOU WISH TO ADDRESS?

A. Yes. Mr. Woody is opposed to the addition of language that states "no local ordinance or regulation shall impose different construction methods". That language currently exists in the St. Louis Metro District tariff. The actual tariff language is as follows:

> The Company's water mains can be extended within St. Louis County or Jefferson County either by the Company's forces or by an independent contractor in accordance with Company's standards and contractual requirements. Because Commission jurisdiction constitutes a legislative recognition that the public interest in proper regulation of public utilities transcends municipal or county lines, and that a centralized control must be entrusted to an agency whose continually developing expertise will assure uniformly safe, proper and adequate service by the Company, no regulations or ordinances of local governments shall be permitted to impose different construction methods (excepting local permit requirements for excavation and restoration of public rights-of-way), material selections, water main sizes or licensing qualifications of the Company's employees or of those independent contractors employed to install, replace or maintain water mains owned or to be owned by the Company when such work is performed under the supervision of or inspection by Company agents or employees, unless such requirement is adopted and approved by the Commission upon complaint alleging that such requirement is necessary for safe and adequate service and requesting uniform application throughout Company's service area.

I am not an attorney but I have been advised by counsel that this provision is consistent with Missouri court decisions in the following cases: See Union Electric Company v. City of Crestwood, 499 S.W.2d 480, 482-83 (Mo. 1973)

and Union Electric Company v. City of Crestwood, 562 S.W.2d 344 (Mo. 1978).

V. METERING OF LARGE USERS IN THE ST. JOSEPH DISTRICT

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON THIS ISSUE?

A. My rebuttal testimony will address statements in the direct testimony of the AGP witness Donald Johnstone.

Q. MR. JOHNSTONE REFERS TO A STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT FROM THE LAST RATE CASE. ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THAT?

A. Yes. I participated in the work group or "collaborative" that was established as part of that Stipulation. The end result was to install metering at AGP that allows collection of usage data on an hourly or daily basis.

Q. ARE THOSE METERS INSTALLED AT AGP?

A. Yes. AGP paid for installation of those meters at an approximate cost of $170 per meter. MAWC on a pilot basis uploaded the data and provided examples to AGP personnel.

Q. IS THE METER COST THE ONLY EXPENSE TO MAWC?

A. No. Normally the meters are read and the data uploaded automatically into our billing system. To capture the detailed information from these meters a person in the office has to manually upload the information from the system to provide reporting and archiving of the data.

Q. DOES MAWC OBJECT TO PROVIDING THESE METERS AND DATA COLLECTION FOR THE 5 LARGEST INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS AS MR. JOHNSTONE PROPOSES?

A. No. As long as MAWC can recover in its rates the costs noted above we do not object to providing this service.

VI. TARIFF PROVISIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL FIRE SPRINKLER SERVICE

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON THIS ISSUE?

A. My rebuttal testimony will address statements in the direct testimony of the St. Louis Fire Sprinkler Association (FSA) witnesses Jason Webb and Kevin Kelly.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL CONCERN WITH THIS TESTIMONY?

A. I believe our proposed consolidated tariff appropriately addresses residential fire suppression systems. Existing rules are of an age that predates the advent of this technology. MAWC's proposed rules address the installation of residential systems and provide flexibility to address this recent and still evolving process. I believe that keeping the rules flexible and in line with the options currently in use and allowed is the best approach. The FSA witnesses desire to limit the rules to the single "preferred" approach advocated by the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) today.

Q. WHAT CONFIGURTIONS OF RESIDENTIAL FIRE SPRINKLER SERVICES ARE YOU PROPOSING?

A. MAWC is proposing three options:

1. Two separate service lines, one being the dedicated line for fire service
2. One service line with the fire line separated prior to the domestic meter
3. One combined service line with one meter.

Q. ARE ALL THREE OPTIONS APPROVED METHODS?

A. As indicated by the testimony of the FSA witnesses all three are approved by NFPA.

Q. ARE YOU PROPOSING THAT ALL LINES, REGARDLESS OF THE OPTION CHOSEN, HAVE METERS?

A. Yes. We believe all services, including fire lines, should be metered at least with a "detector check" type meter. This allows MAWC to track if there is usage on the fire line. This is important in limiting non revenue water and preventing theft of service. For example, if the fire service line is not metered, a customer could tie the two systems together in the home thus bypassing the domestic use meter.

Q. DO YOU HAVE A CONCERN WITH THE ONE COMBINED SERVICE LINE WITH ONE METER?

A. Yes. MAWC generally uses industry standard materials as denoted by the American Waterworks Association (AWWA). In the case of residential sized meters, 5/8" to 1/1/2", there is no meter approved by AWWA for combined domestic and fire service.

Q. WHY DO YOU PROPOSE THIS AS AN OPTION THEN?

A. I believe that as the use of residential fire suppression increases that a meter for combined use will be approved. By providing the three options in the rules MAWC will be positioned to approve their use at that time.

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER ISSUE WITH THE COMBINED SERVICE?

A. Yes. Under current practice, when a customer fails to pay for service and after notice is given in accordance with PSC rules, we shut the service off until payment is received. With the combined service, this will also shut off the fire protection to the home.

Q. HOW IS THIS ANALGOUS TO COMMERCIAL / INDUSTRIAL FIRE LINES?

A. These large commercial / industrial fire lines follow methods one or two described above. Therefore in a non-pay situation the domestic line is shutoff, but the fire service remains active. MAWC only shuts off fire services after receiving approval from the local fire authority. If such policy is continued for

combined residential fire systems, this could lead to hundreds of requests daily to local fire authorities to shut off these customers. This would result in a large burden not only on the company but also on the fire authorities. Further, failure to receive timely confirmation from the fire authorities could significantly undermine collection efforts.

Q. AS PART OF THE PROPOSED RULES YOU STATE THAT THE DECISION ON WHICH OF THE THREE SERVICE TYPES TO USE IS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE COMPANY. WHY IS THAT?

A. The point of sale is at the meter, which we own, and in all operations except St. Louis County MAWC owns the service line through the meter. Since these are part of our system, I believe we need to determine the proper design and specifications. MAWC is responsible for the hydraulics of its system and the operations and engineering functions of the company are charged with evaluating the proper design and operation of our transmission and distribution systems.

Q. IS IT ALWAYS ONLY THE COMPANY'S DISCRETION AS TO WHICH TYPE OF SERVICE IS REQUIRED?

A. No. MAWC coordinates with the Local Municipalities on the way in which the Company provisions the residential fire service. For example, in Joplin, there is a City ordinance specifying two separate service lines (Option 1 above).

Q. IS THE COMPANY WILLING TO DISCUSS THIS ISSUE FURTHER WITH THE FIRE SPRINKLER ASSOCIATION?

A. Yes. During the prehearing conference, we had preliminary discussions with the Fire Sprinkler Association regarding the tariff provisions for residential fire sprinkler service. We have agreed to continue to discuss this with the Fire Sprinkler Association and if there are revisions to our proposed tariff that are mutually agreeable to both parties, we would be willing to make such revisions.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.

Missouri-American Water Company
WR-2010-0131 & SR-2010-0135
Actual Sales and System Delivery

Schedule GAW-4

System Delivery

District Name	2007	2008	2009	Total	Test Year
MO-St. Joseph	6,556,096	6,561,042	6,421,868	19,539,006	6,444,154
MO-Parkville Water	847,369	716,056	687,124	2,250,549	712,977
MO-Warrensburg	930,916	894,541	882,242	2,707,699	898,158
MO-Brunswick	46,981	42,378	34,070	123,429	39,370
MO-Mexico	825,884	758,079	688,834	2,272,797	730,943
MO-Joplin	4,812,251	4,647,346	4,435,119	13,894,716	4,597,106
JF-Jefferson City	1,374,959	1,236,291	1,265,075	3,876,325	1,262,119
Warren Cty - Water	35,844	31,571	30,965	98,380	31,266
STL-Metro	68,646,221	60,033,821	57,148,400	185,828,442	58,915,651
Total	84,076,521	74,921,125	71,593,697	230,591,343	73,631,744

Water Sales

District Name	2007	2008	2009	Total	Test Year
MO-St. Joseph	5,563,220	5,529,743	5,393,141	16,486,104	5,435,461
MO-Parkville Water	752,040	627,573	617,977	1,997,590	628,634
MO-Warrensburg	796,142	740,027	728,670	2,264,839	753,482
MO-Brunswick	35,351	32,723	24,492	92,566	27,876
MO-Mexico	699,408	588,586	539,630	1,827,623	574,945
MO-Joplin	4,473,533	4,296,187	3,577,521	12,347,241	4,077,164
JF-Jefferson City	1,128,003	1,019,110	1,031,863	3,178,977	1,020,659
Warren Cty - Water	32,876	28,580	27,709	89,166	27,718
STL-Metro	55,284,312	48,129,927	46,204,242	149,618,481	47,496,689
Total	68,764,885	60,992,457	58,145,245	187,902,587	60,042,627

Percentage

District Name	2007	2008	2009	3 Yr Avg	Test Year
MO-St. Joseph	15.14%	15.72%	16.02%	15.62%	15.65%
MO-Parkville Water	11.25%	12.36%	10.06%	11.24%	11.83%
MO-Warrensburg	14.48%	17.27%	17.41%	16.36%	16.11%
MO-Brunswick	24.76%	22.78%	28.11%	25.00%	29.20%
MO-Mexico	15.31%	22.36%	21.66%	19.59%	21.34%
MO-Joplin	7.04%	7.56%	19.34%	11.14%	11.31%
JF-Jefferson City	17.96%	17.57%	18.43%	17.99%	19.13%
Warren Cty - Water	8.28%	9.47%	10.52%	9.37%	11.35%
STL-Metro	19.46%	19.83%	19.15%	19.49%	19.38%
Total				18.51%	18.46%