Exhibit No.:

Issues: Customer Service

Customer Billing
Payment Remittance

New Customer Information System

Customer Comment Cards

Checklist

Witness: J. Kay Niemeier

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.: WR-2011-0337

Date Testimony Prepared: January 19, 2012

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION REGULATORY REVIEW DIVISION UTILITY SERVICES

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

J. KAY NIEMEIER

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
CASE NO. WR-2011-0337

Jefferson City, Missouri January 2012

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS OF	
2	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF	
3	J. KAY NIEMEIER	
4	MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY	
5	CASE NO. WR 2011-0337	
6	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
7	CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES	2
8	CUSTOMER BILLING ISSUES	11
9	PAYMENT REMITTANCE PROCESS	14
10	NEW CUSTOMER INFORMATION SYSTEM	15
11	CUSTOMER COMMENT CARDS	16
12	CHECKLIST FOR ACQUISITIONED WATER AND SEWER COMPANIES	17
13	RECOMMENDATIONS	18
14		

1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		J. KAY NIEMEIER
4		MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
5		CASE NO. WR-2011-0337
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
7	A.	J. Kay Niemeier, P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
8	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
9	A.	I am a Management Analyst III with the Missouri Public Service
10	Commission	(Commission).
11	Q.	Are you the same J. Kay Niemeier that previously filed testimony in this
12	proceeding?	
13	A.	Yes.
14	Q.	What information did Staff review in preparation of this testimony?
15	A.	Staff has reviewed customer billing statements, attended local public
16	hearings, me	t with customers at local public hearings, reviewed transcripts of the local
17	public hearings, reviewed customer comment cards, contacted customers submitting	
18	customer comment cards, reviewed Missouri-American Water Company (MAWC or	
19	Company) tariffs and reviewed the Commission's Chapter 13 Rules.	
20		
20		E SUMMARY District to the second of the sec
21	Q.	Please state the purpose of your Rebuttal Testimony.
22	A.	The purpose of my Rebuttal Testimony is to provide an update of Staff's
23	monitoring of	f the customer service, billing and payment remittance issues as they relate

to MAWC. My testimony will also address the Company's new customer information system (CIS), some of the customer comment cards that have been received, the information and/or testimony provided by customers at the local public hearings and the Company's "Checklist" for acquisitioned water and sewer companies. Additionally, my testimony will recommend to the Commission that Staff initiate a program to regularly meet with Company personnel so that both parties can address the Company's customer service, billing and payment remittance issues that are ongoing or were revealed as part of Staff's investigation. The meetings would also be used with the intent to identify and resolve any other matters either party deems necessary.

CUSTOMER SERVICE ISSUES

- Q. Does Staff have any concerns with the Company's customer service?
- A. Yes. Staff has a number of concerns with the customer service provided by the Company.
 - Q. What specific concerns does Staff have regarding the Company's customer service?
 - A. Staff's concerns include the lack of promised responses to customer contacts to the Company and what appears to be incorrect or inconsistent information provided to customers contacting the call centers located in Alton, Illinois and Pensacola, Florida. Staff is aware that the Company's customer service representatives (CSR) respond to customers located in twenty states and are required to be knowledgeable of the various states' tariffs and the various Commissions' rules in order to respond to customer inquiries.
 - Q. What is the purpose of a utility call center?

A. In general, utility call centers perform a critical function in that they often serve as the primary means for customers to contact their utilities. Customers require contact with their utilities regarding a wide range of issues including: reporting emergencies and service outages; initiating, discontinuing, transferring or restoring service; inquiring about their bills; discussing delinquent accounts; and making payment arrangements. Over time, utilities and their customers have developed greater dependence upon call centers as utilities have either closed their local business offices or redirected calls that at one time were answered by such offices.

Call centers may function in a variety of ways with varying degrees of

Call centers may function in a variety of ways with varying degrees of performance. Some of the factors that contribute to a call center's success include: the sophistication of a company's CIS; the call centers' recruitment, selection and hiring processes; the thoroughness of the training of the customer service center representatives; the number of experienced staff and sufficient staffing levels; and the continual monitoring and reviewing of call handling. The training of customer service center representatives is particularly important because these employees should be prepared to answer a variety of customer questions regarding company policies and procedures, including questions concerning the Company's tariffs and the Commission's rules, in MAWC's case for twenty states. The recruitment, training and retention of a quality workforce that must address a multitude of customer calls and correctly document customer information are critical responsibilities within the utility call center function.

The utilities' call center performance is dependent upon having sufficient numbers of well-trained staff to correctly and appropriately answer customer calls within reasonable time periods. Even with advanced technologies such as Integrated Voice

- Response (IVR) offerings, which provides menu options that may eliminate the need to speak directly to a customer service center representative, customers still have a need to speak directly to utility representatives. Utility customers, through rates, pay for the staffing, as well as, the technology, management, training and space required to operate a utility call center.
- Q. What is the number of employees at the Company's call centers in Alton, IL and Pensacola, FL?
- A. The Company's response to Staff's Data Request No. 70 stated that its average number of full-time and part-time customer service representatives for its Alton call center was 400 in 2009, 360 in 2010 and 358 in January through June 2011. The response also stated that its average number of full-time and part-time customer service representatives for its Pensacola call center was 278 in 2009, 264 in 2010 and 241 in January through June 2011.
 - Q. Discuss the number of employees at the Company's call centers.
- A. Staff notes that from January 2009 through June 2011, there was a decrease of 42 in the average number of employees at the Alton call center and a decrease of 37 in the average number of employees at the Pensacola call center, making a total decrease of 79 in the average number of employees responding to Missouri customer contacts.

Staff is concerned that the number of employees at the Company's call centers demonstrates a decreasing trend while it appears the Company is continuing to grow through acquisitions. Additionally, Staff would expect the number of customer contacts to the Company's call centers to increase, at least initially, after the Company

- acquires a new water or sewer facility due to a different mailing address for customer billing, a different billing statement format, a different billing cycle and other matters concerning the customers' accounts. It is possible that following an acquisition, that the transition may strain existing resources such as call center staff due to the introduction of new tariffs, a new customer base, and other issues.
- Q. What was the Company's call center call volume for Missouri customers for January 2009 through June 2011?
- A. The Company's monthly average for 2009 was 27,623 calls, for 2010 was 36,277 calls and for January through June 2011 was 33,211 calls. Staff calculated these monthly averages using nine months of information for 2010, because the Company's data for January, February and March 2010 was not available and only six months of data was used to calculate this average for 2011. Staff calculated the Company's yearly average by dividing the total number of yearly calls by the number of months that Company provided the information. Staff notes that the Company's volume of Missouri calls has increased since 2009.
- Q. Please address Staff's concern with the Company's lack of responses to customer contacts with the Company, which is primarily through the use of its two call centers.
- A. The Company does not maintain local business offices in the locations that it serves in Missouri. In order to contact the Company, customers have three primary methods to initiate an inquiry and for the Company to provide information or resolution to an issue. A customer may call the Company's call centers, use the Company's website (including email) or write the Company a letter. The Company's customer service

representatives in its call centers and/or employees responsible for follow-up to customer contacts are responsible for resolution of customer contacts; however, in some cases, this appears not to be occurring.

- Q. Please explain why Staff has determined that customers are not obtaining a resolution to their inquiries.
- A. Throughout its review, Staff has been informed by numerous customers that they are dissatisfied with the Company because they did not receive a response to a letter sent to the Company or did not receive a promised response following a contact to the Company's call center.

Specific examples of this dissatisfaction include one customer who testified at the local public hearing held Monday, January 9, 2012, at the St. Louis County Library that he had written a letter to two different employees of the Company and did not receive a response to either letter. This customer further testified that he received resolution to his billing issue only after he contacted a television station and it became involved in the matter. Unable to get a response from the Company and unable to access the required information to resolve his issue alone, the customer then contacted a local television station. After the television station got involved, the customer's issue was resolved by the Company. Had such contact with the television station not been made, it appears that the Company would have continued failing to respond to the customer's letter.

At the local public hearing held Monday, January 9, 2012, at University of Missouri St. Louis, North Campus, a customer testified that when he contacted the call center, a customer service representative stated that a supervisor would call him to

discuss his issue. The customer testified that he received no phone call from the supervisor.

Q. What specific examples does Staff have regarding inaccurate information being provided to customers contacting the Company's call centers?

A. Staff, throughout its review, was informed by customers that they had been provided inaccurate information by the customer service center representatives. Some such information is provided in this testimony as examples, but does not encompass the entire issue of inaccurate information being provided to the customers. At least two customers stated they had been informed that they could not receive a credit for a leak issue unless the leak consisted of two times the amount of the bill. Staff is uncertain of the accuracy of this statement and has requested documentation from the Company of its leak adjustment procedures, but has not yet received the information. Numerous customers stated they had contacted the call center and were not provided an explanation or procedure on how or why estimated bills occur. At least two customers stated that customer service center representatives had stated the Company is allowed to estimate, but would not offer reasons or circumstances in which estimation is allowed.

One customer informed Staff that when she contacted the call center requesting the explanation of a charge on her bill that does not normally appear on her bill, the call center representative was not able to accurately answer the customer's inquiry. This inaccurate information created confusion on the customer's part and uncertainty as to the status of her account.

At the local public hearing held Monday, January 9, 2012, at the St. Louis County Library, a customer testified that when she contacted the call center to discuss her

ISRS (Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge) charge, she was told it was based upon consumption. She was later told by a Company employee that the ISRS charge is not based upon consumption. Staff notes that a definition and explanation of the ISRS fee is located on the Company's website, but the explanation does not include the calculation formula. At the very minimum, a customer service representative could have informed the customer that the ISRS information was available on the Company's website.

Another customer at the local public hearing held Monday, January 9,

Another customer at the local public hearing held Monday, January 9, 2012, at the St. Louis County Library stated that upon contacting the call center regarding a billing issue, a customer service representative informed him that there was no way to escalate his issue. This information is erroneous, as the Company has a procedure in place for the escalation of calls received at its call centers.

- Q. What is Staff's recommendation regarding the Company's call center's handling of initial customer contacts?
- A. If the customers' choice of communication is to telephone the Company's call center, the Company should provide resolution to the customer's request. Ideally, first call resolution should be provided the customer. Staff realizes that such resolutions are not always possible and that is why the ability to contact supervisory personnel is critical.
- Q. Does the Company have a policy addressing the escalation of a customer call to its call center?
- A. Yes. In the Company's response to Staff's Data Request No. 75, it indicates that at the first level the customer service representative should solicit the

1 advice and assistance of the Help Queue, if necessary. At the second level, the customer 2 service specialist (CSS) would escalate the call to a team supervisor, if necessary. At the 3 third level, the team supervisor would escalate the call to a group supervisor or manager, 4 if necessary. The response further states: 5 If a resolution cannot be achieved on a customer's account through assistance from a CSS, supervisor, group 6 7 supervisor, or manager it is appropriate to escalate to the 8 appropriate functional area within the CSC. For example: 9 In the case of a required bill adjustment that would be the Billing Department, for an unresolved High Bill complaint 10 that would be the Account Resolution Team (ART). 11 12 The Data Request response further states that: 13 The ART team may issue a service order to gather more 14 information by contacting the customer and/or issuing a service order to the premise. All determinations and 15 16 findings made by the ART team will be communicated to 17 the customer via letter or telephone. The customer will be advised that a Supervisor will be available for further 18 19 discussion. The customer will also be advised of their right 20 to contact their state Public Utility Commission. 21 In addition, the Commission has both an informal and formal process for customer 22 complaints. 23 Q. Does Staff have any other concerns with the Company's customer service 24 center representatives' responses to customers' contacts? 25 A. Yes, there were at least two other noted occasions that Staff was informed 26 that customers' requests to speak to a supervisor were denied. On at least two occasions, 27 the customer was informed that the supervisor was unavailable and the supervisor never returned the customers' phone call, as promised. According to the Company's data 28 29 request response, this would not occur, as such supervisory staff is to be available. The

Company should ensure this does not occur.

- 2
 3
 - service issues?

- Q. Is there any additional information regarding the Company's customer
- A. Yes. Some of the customer information that Staff obtained and had been provided to the Company was information that was beneficial to the Company. The fact that the Company did not respond to the information provided to them by the customers is troubling to Staff. Some of the situations noted were safety hazards and it is to the Company's benefit that these customers are informing it of the public safety issues. The Company should respond to these public safety issues in a timely manner.
- Q. Can you provide an example for such information that is beneficial to the Company?
- A. Yes, Staff is aware of a customer that had contacted the Company's call center multiple times regarding two water main ruptures within a two-year period that caused damage to her property. The customer received no response to her call center contacts, so she wrote a letter to the Company and received no response to her letter. The customer maintained that due to the ruptures, a large piece of asphalt had washed out and her concern was that this situation could cause an accident for school buses that traveled that street. Being persistent, the customer contacted her city government and was informed that the issue was the responsibility of MAWC. Had MAWC initially responded to this customer's inquiries, any potential dangers would have been eliminated in a much more timely manner.
 - Q. Does the Company record its customer calls to its two call centers?
- A. In its response to Staff's Data Request No. 77, the Company stated "The system currently records approximately 5% of the total inbound calls handled, or

approximately 250,000 calls per year. Approximately 90 days worth of recordings are held in rolling storage." In its response to Staff's Data Request No. 181, the Company stated the "recordings are currently used by Company management personnel to record, evaluate, train and coach the CSRs in both Alton, IL and Pensacola, FL locations".

The Company does not have the capability to retrieve 95% of its customer calls to its call centers. Therefore, if a customer or Staff would request a particular customer call for reviewing purposes, it is unlikely the request could be met.

- Q. Does Staff have concerns regarding the Company's call center performance metrics that are being provided monthly?
- A. Staff has not expressed concerns of the Company's call center performance metrics. Staff does have concerns with the qualitative aspects of the call center performance information. Staff's concern stems from the information received from multiple customers that the customer service MAWC is providing is unsatisfactory. Staff recommends that Staff meet periodically with Company personnel to discuss its call center performance, review call center training, Company monitoring of its call center performance and other related call center internal controls.

CUSTOMER BILLING ISSUES

- Q. Has Staff experienced customer billing issues with the Company in the past?
- A. Yes. Throughout the review of the customer billing statements in Case No. WO-2011-0168, Staff noted the occurrence of nine different types of customer billing errors, some of which were violations of the Commission's Chapter 13 Rules. These errors were discussed in Staff Report, Cost of Service, filed November 17, 2011, in

this case. Staff has continued to monitor a sample of the Company's monthly customer
billing statements that are provided by the Company and has noticed a decline in the
occurrences of these nine billing errors.

- Q. Does Staff have any other current billing issue concerns with the Company?
- A. Yes. Staff has concerns with the Company's method of estimating customer bills, the due date printed on the billing statement and the Company charging customers a \$25.00 activation fee.
- Q. What concerns does Staff have with the Company's method of estimating customer bills?
- A. During its review, Staff was informed by customers of occurrences where customer bills were estimated too high. Multiple customers have stated they realize estimates are sometimes necessary, but would prefer closer estimations by the Company. Some customers endure hardships paying the amounts before actual usage and become frustrated trying to determine if their credits on future billing statements are accurate. Some customers alleged that the Company overestimated their bills on the high side in order to receive payment of their accounts in advance of the customers' actual usage. This allegation causes concern for Staff.

Also of concern to Staff is that some of the customers with high estimated bills allege that the Company informed them that they are required to pay the amount of their estimated bill in order to avoid discontinuance of service. One customer testified that he disputed an estimated bill, paid what he believed to be an appropriate amount based upon prior bills, only to receive a disconnection notice from the Company for the

unpaid, but yet disputed amount. Staff asserts that, under Commission Rules, when the customer contacts the Company disputing an estimated bill, that the Company conducts a review of the bill and the customer is not penalized for questioning the bill.

Staff asserts that the Company should estimate bills as specified in the Commission's Rules and work with Staff on any different interpretation of these Rules to come to an agreeable solution to this issue.

- Q. Does Staff have any other concern regarding the Company's estimation of customer bills?
- A. Yes, Staff has a concern regarding the effect estimating of water usage has on a customers' wastewater usage charge. Typically, a customer's water usage during January, February and March are used to calculate their wastewater usage charge for the following twelve month period. If a customer's water usage is estimated higher than it actually is during these three months, it is possible that the customer will be charged an inappropriately high amount for their wastewater usage charge for the next twelve months. When Staff discussed the Company's method of ensuring that its customers, who have had their water usage estimated during these three months, are properly billed for wastewater usage during the next twelve months, the Company indicated that it had no policy. The Company stated that customers will contact the Company if they believe their bill is inaccurate. Staff recommends the Company create a policy for this specific situation.
- Q. What concerns does Staff have with the printed due dates on the customer billing statements?

1	A. Staff is aware that the Company prints a due date and a delinquent date on
2	its customer billing statements and that numerous customers have an issue regarding the
3	fast approaching due date on their billing statement. Some customers stated they had
4	received their billing statement after the due date on the billing statement. Customers
5	have expressed their concern about the possibility of being out of town when their bills
6	are received as well as being disconnected for delinquent payments. The customers that
7	are aware of both billing dates on the billing statement expressed their concern about the
8	process and indicated they were uncomfortable of paying their bill beyond a due date.
9	Company personnel has indicated to Staff that it plans to review the due date printed on
10	the customer billing statements in conjunction with the implementation of its new CIS.
11	Staff encourages such a review.
12	Q. What concerns does Staff have with the Company charging customers the
13	\$25.00 activation fee?
14	A. Staff is of the opinion that the Company's activation fee is not permitted

A. Staff is of the opinion that the Company's activation fee is not permitted by the Company's tariff and is being inappropriately charged to customers. Staff witness, Mr. James M. Russo, will address this matter in his Rebuttal Testimony.

PAYMENT REMITTANCE PROCESS

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Does Staff have any concerns with the Company's payment remittance process?
- A. Yes, Staff identified four occurrences of customers with multiple accounts having their monthly payments improperly applied to their various accounts. These customers have contacted the Company to remedy their situations, all four are on-going

and Staff has requested information from the Company in order to assist in the resolution of these matters.

Additionally, Staff was made aware of a customer that had incorrectly overpaid their account on-line. The customer paid her bill on September 26, 2011, but noticed the error and contacted the Company the first week of October. The customer informed the Company that she had overpaid her account by approximately \$5,000 and requested a refund. On one occasion the Company indicated that the check was in the mail and on another occasion the Company stated that the latest day for the check to be mailed would be October 21, 2011. The customer eventually asked that an attorney contact the Company. Following the attorney's contact of the Company, the customer was issued a refund check dated October 26, 2011. Staff asserts the Company should have a process in place that would identify accounts such as this so that the Company could quickly remedy the situation. Staff contends that the Company should be providing responses to customers' requests without the customer being required to obtain assistance of an outside source.

NEW CUSTOMER INFORMATION SYSTEM

- Q. What is the new CIS?
- A. The new CIS is one aspect of the Company's Business Transformation Program. In the Company's response to Staff's Data Request No. 183, the Company indicated that some of the upgrades to the Company's NICE quality monitoring system include increasing the call recording capabilities from 5% to 50% and increasing the screen captures from 5% to 35%.
 - Q. What benefits does Staff assert will be provided by these upgrades?

Rebuttal Testimony of J. Kay Niemeier

A. Staff is of the opinion that the increase in recording capabilities will allow the Company to retrieve customer calls when necessary. When appropriate, these retrieved calls can be used for customer service training. The increased screen captures will also provide the Company's supervisory personnel necessary information for training of its customer service representatives. As a result, the Company should experience an improvement in handling customer service and billing issues. It may also improve the Company and Staff's ability to ensure customer service matters are being addressed by the Company in a satisfactory manner.

CUSTOMER COMMENT CARDS

Q. Please discuss the customer comment cards.

A. To date, Staff of the Engineering and Management Services Unit (EMSU) has reviewed 332 customer comment cards of the greater than 9,000 executed comment cards received by the Commission as of January 6, 2012. The Company mailed approximately 417,000 customer comment cards to its Missouri customers. Staff has received more mail, approximately 12,000 pieces to date, as a result of this mailing, but these numbers focus on the comment cards mailed back to Staff. More detailed information regarding these comment cards and the process will be provided in a Report separately filed in this case by the Staff's Consumer Services Department. The table below displays the various categories and number of comments received for each category of the 332 customer comment cards the EMSU reviewed:

Billing	275
Customer Service	55
Inaccurate Information	24
Customer Service Center Problems	94
Union Workers	5
Objects to Rate Increase	111
Water Quality	46
Sewer Bill Problem	5
Problem with Receiving Bill	7
High Bill	15
\$25.00 Service Activation Fee	3
Problem with Protection Insurance	2
Tactics	

Staff has contacted and continues to contact customers submitting a comment card that necessitates a response or established a trend in a particular area. Those customers that stated an opinion only and did not appear to have an unresolved issue were not contacted by Staff. Several comment cards did not include customer phone numbers, had a disconnected phone number or the phone number was not located despite efforts to obtain the number. The majority of the comment cards reviewed by EMSU state the customer's poor opinion of the Company's customer service, the Company's unresponsiveness to correspondence, the Company's inability to answer questions, as well as not following through on promised responses to the customer.

CHECKLIST FOR ACQUISITIONED WATER AND SEWER COMPANIES

- Q. What is the Checklist for Acquisitioned Water and Sewer Companies (Checklist)?
- A. The Checklist is a list of items and tasks to be completed and/or reviewed by various company personnel whenever the Company acquires a new water or sewer company.

1	Q.	What would be the purpose of a Checklist
2	A.	The Checklist would provide the Compa

A. The Checklist would provide the Company a comprehensive list of all tasks and items to be performed, reviewed and/or matters to be aware of whenever the Company acquires a new water or sewer company. As discussed with the Company, the Checklist would be a work in progress, but it would assist the Company in making an acquisition as seamless as possible for the customers and assist the Company in achieving easier transition with hopefully fewer problems.

Q. What tasks and items might be included on the Checklist?

A. Some of the tasks and items might include verification and accuracy of the following: 1) the customer rate, 2) meter number, 3) premise number, 4) customer mailing address, 5) first month customer billing statements, 6) rate type, 7) primacy fees, and 8) tax rate, if applicable.

Q. Does the Company currently have a Checklist?

A. Staff is not sure. During the Staff's monitoring of the customer billing statements following the acquisition of Aqua Missouri, Inc. in Case No. WO-2011-0168, Staff was informed by a Company employee that the Company would be developing such a Checklist. Staff expressed its opinion that such a checklist could be beneficial to ensure improvements for the Company and requested a copy of the Checklist be provided Staff when completed. Staff has not yet received a copy of the Checklist.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Q. What does Staff recommend in this case?
- A. Staff recommends that following the completion of this case, in addition to the monthly statistical data currently being provided by the Company, the appropriate

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

1	Company personnel meet periodically with Staff to discuss customer service issues, call
2	center performance and training, customer billing issues, payment remittance issues and
3	any other issues that Staff determines necessary to discuss. Staff will work with the
4	Company in determining the meeting dates, the subject matters to be discussed and
5	meeting locations. Staff anticipates that the meetings will be held on an as-needed basis
6	and will continue until Staff determines they are no longer necessary. If the informal
7	structuring of these meetings is not successful, Staff will take any steps it believes
8	necessary to bring the matter before the Commission.
9	Q. Why does Staff recommend these periodic meetings with the Company?
10	A. Staff is aware of a variety of customer service, customer billing and
11	payment remittance issues that the Company is experiencing as illustrated by this

Rebuttal Testimony. Although the monthly call center statistical data is beneficial, Staff would like to ensure that quality service and customer contact resolution is adequately maintained. Staff's desire is to work with the Company to assist and hopefully resolve these issues. Additionally, these meetings would provide the opportunity for discussion between the Company and Staff should any customer related issues occur in the future.

- Q. Does Staff meet with other utilities to discuss customer service and or billing issues?
- Yes, Staff is currently meeting on a quarterly basis with Kansas City A. Power & Light Company. The Report and Order in Case No. EM-2007-0374 states:

Beginning ninety days after the closure of the authorized transactions, KCPL and Aquila will, on a quarterly basis, engage in periodic customer service performance reviews with the Commission's Staff, including the quarterly filing, with Staff of monthly service quality data;

- Staff has also had similar regular meetings with other regulated utility companies in Missouri when service quality performance concerns have arisen in areas such as call center performance, estimated meter reads, service order backlogs and other topics.

 Q. Does Staff have any other recommendations?
 - A. Yes, Staff recommends the following: 1) that the Company provide its Checklist to Staff, 2) that the Company create a policy to ensure the estimated usage used for wastewater bills is accurate and 3) that the Company continue its review of the due date printed on bills in conjunction with the implementation of the new CIS.
 - Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?
 - A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Missouri-American Water)

Company's Request for Implement A General Rate I and Sewer Service Provi Service Areas	Increase for Water)
•	AFFIDAVIT OF J. KAY NIEMEIER
STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss.
COUNTY OF COLE)
of the foregoing Rebuttal Tea be presented in the above case	ul age, on her oath states: that she has participated in the preparation stimony in question and answer form, consisting of 20 pages to se; that the answers in the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony were given ge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are f her knowledge and belief.
	9. Kay Memlus J. Kay Niemeier
Subscribed and sworn to befo	ore me this day of January, 2012.
D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: December 08, 201 Commission Number: 08412071	Describbing Public