Exhibit No.:

Issues: Weather Normalization Witness: Edward L. Spitznagel, Jr.

Exhibit Type: Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony
Sponsoring Party: Missouri-American Water Company

Case No.: WR-2003-0500 Date Filed: December 31, 2003

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO. WR-2003-0500

SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF EDWARD L. SPITZNAGEL, JR.

ON BEHALF OF
MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI

DEFORE 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 SERVICE

CASE NO. WR-2003-0500

AFFIDAVIT OF EDWARD L. SPITZNAGEL, JR.

Edward L. Spitznagel, Jr., being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is the witness who sponsors the accompanying supplemental rebuttal testimony entitled "Supplemental Rebuttal Testimony of Edward L. Spitznagel, Jr."; that said supplemental rebuttal 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 supplemental rebuttal testimony and schedules, he would respond as therein set forth; and that the aforesaid supplemental rebuttal testimony and schedules are true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

lward L. Spitznagel &, Edward L. Spitznagel, Jr.

State of Missouri County of St. Louis SUBSCRIBED and sworn to

Before me this 3/3 day of December 2003.

Notary Public

My commission expires:

STACI A. OLSEN
Notary Public - Notary Seal
STATE OF MISSOURI

St. Charles County

My Commission Expires: Mar. 20, 2005

| 1 | | WITNESS INTRODUCTION |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | Q. | PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND EMPLOYER. |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | A. | My name is Edward L. Spitznagel, Jr., and my business address is Campus Box 1146, |
| 7 | | One Brookings Drive, St Louis, Missouri 63130. I am employed by Washington |
| 8 | | University. |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | Q. | HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY IN THIS |
| 11 | | PROCEEDING? |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | A. | Yes, I have submitted direct and rebuttal testimony in this proceeding. |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | Q. | WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL |
| 16 | | TESTIMONY? |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | A. | The purpose is to address the issues raised by Mr. Patterson in his Supplemental Direct |
| 19 | | Testimony. |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | Q. | WHAT REVISED ESTIMATE OF GMD DOES MR. PATTERSON MAKE FOR |
| 22 | | ST. LOUIS QUARTERLY RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS? |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | A. | His revised estimate is 292.05 GMD. For consistency purposes it should be pointed out |
| 25 | | that in previous testimony, the term GCD is used. These are synonymous, GMD |
| 26 | | standing for Gallons per Meter per Day, and GCD standing for Gallons per Customer |
| 27 | | (per) Day. |
| 28 | | |
| 29 | Q. | WHAT HAS LED TO THE REVISED ESTIMATE? |
| 30 | | |
| 31 | Δ | In evamining the relationship between GMD and DNSHOPT (difference between |

current shortfall and average shortfall for weather) over the decade 1993 to 2002, he has
found an unexpected drop in consumption in 2002, given that 2002 in fact had the
largest value of DNSHORT of the decade.

4

5 Q. DOES MR. PATTERSON INDICATE A REASON FOR THE UNEXPECTED DROP?

7

Yes, he proposes several different possible reasons, which are difficult to disentangle from one another. One is the possibility of a flaw in the new billing system, while another is the shifting of the billing months for a large number of continuing customers.

11

12 Q. HAVE YOU DISCOVERED ANY OTHER POSSIBLE REASONS FOR THE 13 DROP?

14

15 A. Yes, based on the individual route data for the added customers from Webster Groves 16 and Florissant, it can be seen that both sets of customers use much less water per day 17 than the rest of the St. Louis District quarterly residential customers. Mr. Patterson's 18 overall weather-normalized GMD estimate is 292.05 whereas twelve-month periods for 19 Webster Groves, one containing the dry summer of 2002 and the other containing the 20 summer of 2003 have GMD values of 243.41 and 239.36 respectively. The difference 21 is even more striking for Florissant, with GMD values of 190.31 and 181.46 22 respectively. These calculations are given in Schedules ELS-1SR and ELS-2SR.

23

24

Q. DO THESE LOW GMD VALUES OF THE NEW CUSTOMERS ACCOUNT FULLY FOR THE DROP?

2526

A. No, but they do account for forty percent of the drop. To demonstrate this, I removed the Webster Groves and Florissant consumption and customers from Mr. Patterson's 2002 GMD of 277.41 found in Schedule 2 of his supplemental direct testimony. The GMD shot up to 286.15, as seen in Schedule ELS-3SR. I then reran Mr. Patterson's regression model and found that the coefficient of the DUMMY term changed from

| 1 | | -21.93 to -13.19. This new smaller-magnitude coefficient is still statistically |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | significant (P-value = .003), so it cannot be ignored, but the dramatic change in its size |
| 3 | | cannot be ignored either. |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | Q. | HOW CAN THE LOWER CONSUMPTIONS OF THESE TWO NEW SETS OF |
| 6 | | CUSTOMERS BE ACCOUNTED FOR IN THE WEATHER NORMALIZED |
| 7 | | ESTIMATES? |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | A. | We only have a little less than two years of consumption data, so we have no way to |
| 10 | | weather-normalize them. However, we can weather-normalize without them, and then |
| 11 | | to be conservative, combine their 2002 dry-year GMD estimates with the weather- |
| 12 | | normalized estimate for the continuing customers. |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | Q. | HOW DOES ONE COMBINE THESE ESTIMATES, AND WHAT IS THE |
| 15 | | COMBINED GMD VALUE? |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | A. | The GMD estimate for the continuing customers is 292.05, which is the intercept of the |
| 18 | | regression. Because the regression contains the dummy term, that estimate is |
| 19 | | unaffected by removal of the Webster Groves and Florissant customers and their |
| 20 | | consumption values. We simply take a weighted average of the continuing customer |
| 21 | | GMD, 292.05, and the Webster Groves and Florissant conservatively high GMD's of |
| 22 | | 243.41 and 190.31, where the weights are the numbers of customers in each group, |
| 23 | | 287,335, 8,600, and 14,500 respectively. This is done in Schedule ELS-3RS. The |
| 24 | | weighted combination is 285.95 GMD. |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | Q. | DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL REBUTTAL |
| 27 | | TESTIMONY? |
| 28 | | |

29

A.

Yes, it does.

Missouri American Water Company Rate Case WR-2003-0500

Schedule ELS-1SR

Calculation of Webster Groves Residential Water Consumption

| Mgals | Routes | Revenue Periods | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------|
| 35801.24 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 3/01/2002 to 3/31/2002 | |
| 20168.14 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 3/01/2002 to 3/31/2002 | |
| 639.62 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 4/01/2002 to 4/30/2002 | |
| 163.05 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 4/01/2002 to 4/30/2002 | |
| 171.47 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 5/01/2002 to 5/31/2002 | |
| 1312.18 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 5/01/2002 to 5/31/2002 | |
| 97328.82 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 6/01/2002 to 6/30/2002 | |
| 56232.41 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 6/01/2002 to 6/30/2002 | |
| 766.89 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 7/01/2002 to 7/31/2002 | |
| 458.67 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 7/01/2002 to 7/31/2002 | |
| 132.53 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 8/01/2002 to 8/31/2002 | |
| 199.63 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 8/01/2002 to 8/31/2002 | |
| 152513.76 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 9/01/2002 to 9/30/2002 | |
| 83776,49 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 9/01/2002 to 9/30/2002 | |
| 1477.23 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 10/01/2002 to 10/31/2002 | |
| 787.72 | For Routes 480025 to 480030 | For Bill Dates 10/01/2002 to 10/31/2002 | |
| 611.27 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 11/01/2002 to 11/30/2002 | |
| 326.95 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 11/01/2002 to 11/30/2002 | |
| 120463,54 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For Bill Dates 12/01/2002 to 12/31/2002 | |
| 60880.99 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For Bill Dates 12/01/2002 to 12/31/2002 | |
| 329,80 | For Routes 450000 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 1/2003 | |
| 1865.63 | For Routes 480000 to 489999 | For the Revenue Period: 1/2003 | |
| 415.22 | For Routes 450000 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 2/2003 | |
| 1411.64 | For Routes 480000 to 489999 | For the Revenue Period: 2/2003 | |
| 98936.74 | For Routes 450000 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 3/2003 | |
| 83392.81 | For Routes 480000 to 489999 | For the Revenue Period: 3/2003 | |
| 1285.85 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 4/2003 | |
| 910.43 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For the Revenue Period: 4/2003 | |
| 2137.14 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 5/2003 | |
| 133.95 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For the Revenue Period: 5/2003 | |
| 103640.97 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 6/2003 | |
| 52929.27 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For the Revenue Period: 6/2003 | |
| 3749.18 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 7/2003 | |
| 3436.37 | For Routes 480025 to 480035 | For the Revenue Period: 7/2003 | |
| 231.70 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 8/2003 | |
| 64.44 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For the Revenue Period: 8/2003 | |
| 133576.79 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 9/2003 | |
| 78199.65 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For the Revenue Period: 9/2003 | |
| 808.65 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 10/2003 | |
| 2149.94 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For the Revenue Period: 10/2003 | |
| 551.26 | For Routes 450030 to 460002 | For the Revenue Period: 11/2003 | |
| 350.86 | For Routes 480025 to 480034 | For the Revenue Period: 11/2003 | |
| Total Consumption | on Billed in 2002: | 634212.6 | GMD |
| Twelve-Month Co | nsumption including Summer of 2002: | 764595.1 | 243.41 |
| Twelve-Month Co | nsumption including Summer of 2003: | 751852.8 | 239.36 |

Missouri American Water Company Rate Case WR-2003-0500

Schedule ELS-2SR

Calculation of Florissant Residential Water Consumption

Twelve-Month Consumption including Summer of 2003:

| Mgals | Routes | Revenue Periods |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| 504.05 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 3/01/2002 to 3/31/2002 |
| 81.39 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 3/01/2002 to 3/31/2002 |
| 19.43 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 3/01/2002 to 3/31/2002 |
| 92593.44 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 4/01/2002 to 4/30/2002 |
| 111099.04 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 4/01/2002 to 4/30/2002 |
| 1281.38 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 4/01/2002 to 4/30/2002 |
| 10429.59 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 5/01/2002 to 5/31/2002 |
| 19092.36 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 5/01/2002 to 5/31/2002 |
| 8813.92 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 5/01/2002 to 5/31/2002 |
| 2372.38 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 6/01/2002 to 6/30/2002 |
| 5910.83 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 6/01/2002 to 6/30/2002 |
| 1296.86 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 6/01/2002 to 6/30/2002 |
| 122107.52 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 7/01/2002 to 7/31/2002 |
| 117314.56 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 7/01/2002 to 7/31/2002 |
| 13712.73 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 7/01/2002 to 7/31/2002 |
| 5158.63 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 8/01/2002 to 8/31/2002 |
| 10579.08 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 8/01/2002 to 8/31/2002 |
| 578.37 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 8/01/2002 to 8/31/2002 |
| 175.98 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 9/01/2002 to 9/30/2002 |
| 1229.24 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 9/01/2002 to 9/30/2002 |
| 266.34 121 8 11.32 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 9/01/2002 to 9/30/2002 |
| 114785.26 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 10/01/2002 to 10/31/2002 For Bill Dates 10/01/2002 to 10/31/2002 |
| 13743.04 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 10/01/2002 to 10/31/2002 |
| 6316,98 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 11/01/2002 to 11/30/2002 |
| 7468.49 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 11/01/2002 to 11/30/2002 |
| 210.32 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 11/01/2002 to 11/30/2002 |
| 89.13 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For Bill Dates 12/01/2002 to 12/31/2002 |
| 60.78 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For Bill Dates 12/01/2002 to 12/31/2002 |
| 74.77 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For Bill Dates 12/01/2002 to 12/31/2002 |
| 293.86 | For Routes 190000 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 1/2003 |
| 333.73 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 1/2003 |
| 0.00 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 1/2003 |
| 45414.39 | For Routes 190000 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 2/2003 |
| 157765.83 14086.50 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 2/2003 |
| 95.82 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 2/2003 For the Revenue Period: 3/2003 |
| 1244.15 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 3/2003 |
| 114.42 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 3/2003 |
| 268.53 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 4/2003 |
| 160.07 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 4/2003 |
| 50,85 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 4/2003 |
| 161683.07 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 5/2003 |
| 60778.72 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 5/2003 |
| 10494.98 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 5/2003 |
| 1331.84 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 6/2003 |
| 6291.84 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 6/2003 |
| 840.79 726.14 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 6/2003 |
| 164.45 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 7/2003 For the Revenue Period: 7/2003 |
| 106.20 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 7/2003 |
| 122981.96 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 8/2003 |
| 110192.24 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 8/2003 |
| 12291.96 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 8/2003 |
| 2330.46 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 9/2003 |
| 2184.42 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 9/2003 |
| 279.80 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 9/2003 |
| 422.35 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 | For the Revenue Period: 10/2003 |
| 64.54 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 10/2003 |
| 106.21 | For Routes 210044 to 210045 | For the Revenue Period: 10/2003 |
| 119310,39 115605,19 | For Routes 190020 to 190036 For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 11/2003 For the Revenue Period: 11/2003 |
| 12796.52 | For Routes 200025 to 200041 | For the Revenue Period: 11/2003 For the Revenue Period: 11/2003 |
| | | |
| | otion Billed in 2002: | 789177.2 |
| I welve-Month | Consumption including Summer of 2002: | 1007921.0 |

G**M**D 190.31

181.46

961036.9

Missouri American Water Company Rate Case WR-2003-0500

Schedule ELS-3SR

Demonstration that much of the 2002 anomaly is due to addition of low-consumption customers from Webster Groves and Florissant

Leads to the regression model: The data below, computed by Dennis Patterson, except for 2002, in which Webster Groves and Florissant consumption is removed:

| | | | | | | | | | Significance F | 3.00133E-05 | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------------|---|-------------------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | F | 65.09053447 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | MS | 810.2954068 405.1477034 65.09053447 3.00133E-05 | 6.224372048 | |
| | | | | | | | | | SS | 810.2954068 | 43.57060434 6.224372048 | 852 BEEN 111 |
| TUC | Statistics | 0.974152222 | 0.948972551 | 0.93439328 | 2.494869145 | 10 | | | φ | 2 | 7 | o |
| SUMMARY OUTPUT | Regression Statistics | Multiple R | R Square | Sau | Standard Error 2,494869145 | Observations | | ANOVA | | Regression | Residual | Total |
| DUMMY 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | | | |
| DNSHORT -2.18583 | 0.13807 | -0.82838 | -0.95675 | -0.15905 | -1.59080 | 0.02134 | -0.66038 | -0.26983 | 0.56437 | | | |
| GMD 262.7571 | 293.8470 | 282.0039 | 284.5028 | 287.2174 | 270.9236 | 294.5622 | 281.8458 | 286.8267 | 286.1528 | | | |
| YEAR 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | | | |

| Social City Colair Cola |
|--|
| ntercept 292.0487573 1.169979527 249.6186903 4.37204E-15 |
| DNSHORT 12.93244208 1.140949364 11.33480809 9.31445E-06 |
| JUMMY -13.19462119 3.011259207 -4.381762008 0.003227545 - |
| |

Upper 95% 294.8153173 15.63035668 -6.074129734

289.2821973 10.23452747 -20.31511264

Lower 95%

P-value

t Stat

Coefficients Standard Error 292.0487573 1.169979527

853.8660111

Total

Conservative (over) Estimate of Weather Normalized GMD with Webster Groves and Florissant included in the Customer Base:

| ssant) | | | | 285.95 GMD |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 8.3916E+07 (All Customers Except Webster Groves and Florissant) | | | | ednals |
| Except Webster | s) | | | 310435 |
| (All Customers I | 2.0933E+06 (Webster Groves) | (Florissant) | • | 8.8769E+07 divided by |
| 8.3916E+07 | 2.0933E+06 | 2.7595E+06 (Florissant) | | 8.8769E+07 |
| ednals | equals | equals | | |
| 287335 | 8600 | 14500 | | 310435 |
| times | times | times | | |
| 292.0487573 | 243.4124636 | 190.3129250 | | Sums: |