Exhibit No.:

Issue:

Customer Service

Witness:

DEBORAH ANN BERNSEN

Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit: MoPSC Staff Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.:

WM-2001-309

Date Testimony Prepared:

June 26, 2001

## MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

**UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION** 

FILED<sup>2</sup>

JUN 2 6 2001 Missouri Public Service Commission

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

**OF** 

**DEBORAH ANN BERNSEN** 

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY, ET. AL

**CASE NO. WM-2001-309** 

Jefferson City, Missouri June 2001

1	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2	OF
3	DEBORAH ANN BERNSEN
4	MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
5	CASE NO. WM-2001-309
6	Q. Please state your name.
7	A. My name is Deborah Ann Bernsen.
8	Q. Please state your business address.
9	A. My business address is P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
10	Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
11	A. I am employed as a Management Analyst for the Missouri Public Service
12	Commission (Commission or PSC).
13	Q. Describe your educational and professional background.
14	A. I graduated from the University of Missouri-Columbia in 1975 with a
15	Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration. I received a Masters degree in
16	Public Administration in 1990 from the same university. I have passed three of the four
17	parts of the Certified Internal Auditor (CIA) examination.
18	I have been employed by the Commission since 1976, when I began a
19	graduate internship as an aide to the Commissioners. I subsequently entered the
20	Consumer Services Department of the PSC as a Consumer Services Specialist responding
21	to consumer complaints and inquiries. I joined the Management Services Department in
22	1978 as a Management Analyst and since that time have had responsibility for
23	conducting and directing reviews of management operating and control systems at utility

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

companies under the Commission's jurisdiction. The name of the Management Services Department was changed to the Engineering and Management Services Department in February 2000.

- What is the purpose of your testimony? Q.
- The purpose of my testimony is to recommend the reporting of A. performance data from the Alton, Illinois Call Center to the Commission. I will also specify the timing and duration of the reporting that I recommend as well as the establishment and monitoring of performance goals for the Call Center.
- Q. Why is Staff recommending the establishment of reporting on Call Center performance?
- The Call Center represents one aspect of the quality of service that the A. customer receives. Quality of service issues are of particular concern in the consideration of a merger request by a utility.
- 0. Why are quality of service issues of particular concern in the consideration of a merger request by utility companies?
- Α. The quality of the service received by customers becomes particularly vulnerable, given the events which normally occur during or after a merger. financial pressures associated with a merger may encourage a company to engage in expense reduction efforts that can impact service quality. Computerized systems, such as customer information systems, may be changed at the acquired company so that the two companies' methods of dealing with customer records and inquiries are compatible. Operating functions are consolidated, which normally leads to staffing reductions. Local offices are often closed and the acquiring company may significantly reduce its presence

.

or the presence of the acquired company in the communities. These situations and others may occur in the name of taking advantage of synergies and efficiencies. All of these factors can contribute to a reduction in the level of service experienced by the Missouri customer of either company involved in the merger.

- Q. Why should this be a concern in merger cases?
- A. There is clear direction by the Commission in Missouri Code of State Regulations Rule 4 CSR 240-2.060, that applications for authority to merge must include reasons why the proposal is not detrimental to the public interest. Mergers, therefore, in the Staff's view, should not result in a deterioration of customer service because such deterioration is not in the public interest.
- Q. Has the Staff expressed concern with quality of service issues in prior merger applications?
- A. Yes. The Staff has expressed this concern in several prior merger cases where stipulations and agreements were subsequently reached by the parties and approved by the Commission. The first instance was in the Stipulation and Agreement in Case No. EM-97-515, the Western Resources, Inc. and Kansas City Power & Light Company merger. A second instance was in the Stipulation and Agreement in Case No. GM-2000-43, respecting Southern Union and Pennsylvania Enterprises, Inc. In both cases, indicators to measure significant customer service components in a post-merger environment were jointly developed and agreed to by the Staff, the companies and the Office of the Public Counsel in a Stipulation and Agreement. These indicators included customer call center measurements, as well as technical indicators for distribution system reliability. The Staff has also expressed its interest in customer

service indicators by filing testimony in Case No. GM-2000-312, concerning the merger of Atmos Energy Company and Associated Natural Gas Company. In that case, the Commission approved a Stipulation and Agreement containing proposed customer service indicators on April 20, 2000. Most recently the Staff has expressed its concern with the quality of service in merger cases in Case No. EM-2000-292, regarding the authority to merge St. Joseph Light & Power Company with UtiliCorp United Inc. and in Case No. EM-2000-369, regarding the authority to merge Empire District Electric Company with UtiliCorp United Inc.

- Q. What has the Staff supported in previous cases regarding methods to ensure that the level of customer service is maintained in a post-merger environment?
- A. In the past, the Staff has recommended the utilization of several indicators designed to assist in assessing the level of service being provided to the customer. Once developed, these indicators provide a benchmark over time to determine any changes to service received by the customer. Monitoring and reporting systems also have been included to track these indicators.
- Q. In your opinion, can the use of such indicators provide complete assurance that customers are receiving the same level of service as before a merger?
- A. No. While the use of indicators can provide a useful management tool and can be used to help direct further inquiry, it cannot provide assurance that deficiencies are not present in other facets of customer service. However, indicators do provide a useful tool to monitor changes and trends in specific areas and to alert the company and Staff to deviations from the intended or required level of customer service and potential problems.

Q. What quality of service indicators should the Company be required to provide?

A. At a minimum, the Company should be required to provide data on Abandoned Call Rate (ACR), Average Speed of Answer (ASA), 1<sup>st</sup> Call Effectiveness (percent of calls resolved on first contact), and Average Customer Inquiry Response Time. The Average Customer Inquiry Response Time is the number of days between credit-or billing-related inquiry and completion of back office investigation, as defined by correspondence sent to the customer with resolution, or field work issued and resolution monitored. The Alton Call Center will be monitoring these indicators on a regular basis to evaluate its own workload and effectiveness. These measures will assist in an assessment of the level of customer service being provided by the Call Center to the customer and will allow the Staff to monitor this after the transition to a centralized call center operation.

- Q. Has the Company established objectives for these indicators for the Alton Call Center?
  - A. Yes. The Company has established the following performance goals:
    - An annual ACR target of 5.5% plus a 100 basis point variance (a maximum allowable level of 6.5%);
    - An ASA target of answering 80% of its incoming calls within 30 seconds;
    - 1<sup>st</sup> Call Effectiveness is to be at least 85% for a defined set of call types;

5

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

18

17

19

21

22

20

Average Customer Inquiry Response Time target average is to not exceed three business days.

- Q. Does the Company presently maintain information on call center performance at its facilities?
- A. No. The current Missouri call centers do not maintain operating performance data with which to track and evaluate the level of service the customer is receiving. However, the American Water Works system opened a state-of-the-art call center in Alton, Illinois in April 2001. This facility will eventually handle all inquiries for the entire company and has implemented a number of technological improvements that were not previously utilized in other centers. One of these improvements will be the technology to allow the Company to monitor and evaluate in detail key performance statistics for call center operations.
- What is the Company's proposed conversion schedule for its Missouri Q. properties regarding Call Center operations?
- A. The Company anticipates converting its Missouri customers to its nationwide American Water Works Call Center in two phases. The conversion for the 320,000 customers of the former St. Louis County Water Company (SLCWC) is scheduled for September 2001. The conversion for the 105,000 customers of the former Missouri American Water (Mo Am) and Jefferson City Water Works (JCWW) is scheduled for December 2002.
- What customer notification does Staff request that the Company provide Q. regarding the conversion to the Alton Call Center?

4

5

6

7 8

9 10

12

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

The Staff recommends that Staff be notified 30 days in advance of the A. transition of each MAWC operating district to the Alton Call Center. The Staff also believes that the Company should be required to notify affected customers with billing inserts and local newspaper ads in each district prior to the conversion.

- Q. Describe the proposed timetable that the Staff recommends the Company meet in reporting Call Center data.
- The Staff recommends that the Company begin reporting monthly A. information on a quarterly basis in the first full quarter after conversion of the first Missouri operations. For example, if the Company is able to maintain the current conversion schedule of September 2001 for SLCWC, then data collection should begin in October 2001. The first formal reporting of the data should begin within 45 days after the close of the first quarter of 2001 or approximately February 14, 2002. The Staff believes that the data should be maintained separately, if possible, for just the Missouri operations. Within 90 days after the end of the calendar year, the Company should submit a report to the Staff which should include actual performance as compared to the goals, explanation of any deviation from the goals, actions to be undertaken to improve performance, where necessary, and modifications to the goals.
- Q. How long does the Staff recommend that this information be reported to the Commission?
- The Staff recommends that the reporting requirements be in effect for A. eight quarters after the last Missouri property has been converted to the Alton Call Center. If the present conversion schedule is maintained, this means that the reporting requirement for all Missouri properties should continue through the fourth

## Rebuttal Testimony of Deborah Ann Bernsen

1

2

3

4

5

- quarter of 2004. This should provide a reasonable assurance that the conversion to a consolidated call center has not adversely affected the level of service being provided to the customer.
  - 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 the Joint Application of Missouri-American Water Company, St. Louis County Water Company d/b/a Missouri-American Water Company and Jefferson City Water Works Company d/b/a Missouri-American Water Company for authority to merge St. Louis County Water Company d/b/a Missouri-American Water Company and Jefferson City Water Works Company d/b/a Missouri-American Water Company with and into Missouri-American Water Company and, in connection therewith other related transactions.	) ) ) Case No. WM-2001-309 ) ) )		
AFFIDAVIT OF DEBORAH ANN BERNSEN			
STATE OF MISSOURI ) ss.			
COUNTY OF COLE ) ss.			
Deborah Ann Bernsen, of lawful age, on her oath states: that she has participated in the preparation of the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of pages to be presented in the above case; that the answers in the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony were given by her; that she has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true and correct to the best of her knowledge and belief.			
Sport Of Seborah Ann H	Bernsen		

Subscribed and sworn to before me this day of June 2001.



TONI M. CHARLTON NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF MISSOURI COUNTY OF COLE My Commission Expires December 28, 2004