1 STATE OF MISSOURI 2 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 3 _____ 4 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 5 Public Hearing 6 December 3, 2003 7 St. Charles, Missouri Volume 10 8 _____ 9 In the Matter of) 10 Missouri-American Water) Company's Tariff to) Case No. WR-2003-0500 11 Revise Water and Sewer)) Rate Schedules 12 13 _____ 14 RONALD PRIDGIN, Presiding, DEPUTY CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE 15 CONNIE MURRAY, BRYAN FORBIS, 16 17 COMMISSIONERS. 18 _____ 19 20 21 REPORTED BY: 22 Brad Mowrer, RPR Taylor & Associates 23 1014 Lami St. Louis, MO 63104 24 (314) 644-2191 1-800-280-DEPO 25

```
1
    APPEARANCES:
 2
 3
    Missouri Public Service Commission:
          Cliff Snodgrass
 4
          Governor Office Bldg., Suite 800
          200 Madison St., P.O. Box 360
 5
          Jefferson City, MO 65102-0360
    Office of the Public Counsel:
 6
          M. Ruth O'Neill
 7
          Department of Economic Development
          Governor Office Building, Suite 650
 8
          200 Madison Street
          P.O. Box 2230
          Jefferson City, MO 65102
9
10
    Missouri-American Water Company:
          Richard T. Ciottone
          Brydon, Swearengen & England, P.C.
11
          312 East Capitol Ave.
12
         Box 456
          Jefferson City, MO 65102
13
               and
          David P. Abernathy
         American Water
14
          535 North New Ballas Road
15
          St. Louis, MO 63141-6875
16
    Witnesses:
17
          Eugene Pepper
          159 Cedarmill Court
          St. Charles County, Missouri 63304
18
          Chet Boeke
19
          3114 Arrow Rock Drive
20
          St. Charles, Missouri 63303
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Good afternoon. The 2 Missouri Public Service Commission has set this 3 time for a local hearing in the matter of Missouri-American Water Company's Tariffs to Revise 4 5 Water and Sewer Rate Schedules in Case No. WR-2003-0500 in which Missouri-American Water 6 Company seeks a general water rate increase. 7 8 Specifically, Missouri-American's 9 proposed water service tariffs are designed to 10 produce an annual increase of approximately 12.2 percent or 20 million dollars in the company's 11 12 water service revenues and 3.3 percent or \$1,637 in 13 the company's sewer service revenues. 14 Additionally, the Commission staff has recently filed an overearnings complaint against the 15 16 company, which charges that the company is earning 17 about 20 million dollars more than it should with 18 its current rates. The Missouri Public Service Commission 19 20 regulates the rates charged by investor owned utility companies in Missouri to insure that those 21 rates are just and reasonable. The Commission also 22 23 regulates the quality of service and safety of the 24 operations of investor owned utilities. The 25 Commission is made up of five commissioners, two of

1 whom are here today. The commissioners are 2 appointed by the governor to fix terms and 3 confirmed by the Senate. The commissioners employ a staff of engineers, accountants, attorneys, 4 5 financial analysts, and other specialists in the field of utility regulation. 6 7 I'm Ron Pridgin. I am a regulatory law judge for the Missouri Public Service Commission, 8 9 and I will preside over this afternoon's hearing. 10 With me this afternoon are, to my left, 11 Commissioner Connie Murray and Commissioner Bryan 12 Forbis to my right. This is an official hearing of the 13 Missouri Public Service Commission, and the 14 statements and testimony of witnesses will be 15 16 recorded by the court reporter and must be given under oath. All of the commissioners will have a 17 chance to read all of your remarks. In addition to 18 today's hearing, nine other local public hearings 19 20 are being held in this case in other areas of the 21 state. 22 Also, a trial type evidentiary hearing 23 will be held beginning on December 15th, 2003, 24 starting at 9 a.m. at the Commission offices at the 25 Governor Office Building in Jefferson City,

1 Missouri. That hearing will be open to the public, 2 and the company will have the burden of showing 3 that the proposed rate increase is necessary. The 4 parties will present their witnesses for and against the proposed rate increase at that time, 5 6 and the staff's overearnings complaint will be tried at the same time. 7

8 The purpose of the hearing today is to 9 hear from you on the subject of the proposed rate 10 increase. The company will not present witnesses and will not answer questions. This is your chance 11 12 to testify, and your remarks will be made a part of 13 the official record of this case.

I will call the name of each witness who 14 15 is signed up to speak. I will call you in the order in which you signed up. When your name is 16 17 called, please come forward to the podium here. I 18 will then place you under oath. I will ask you a few preliminary questions, including how to spell 19 your name for the court reporter. You will then 20 21 have a chance to make your statement. There then 22 may be questions from counsel, from the 23 commissioners, or from myself. Please do not leave 24 the podium until you're excused. 25

There may be somebody who wished to

1 testify but, because of religious beliefs, cannot 2 take an oath. If so, please indicate that when you 3 are asked to be sworn so that you may be affirmed 4 instead. 5 Does anyone have any questions about the 6 procedure we will follow? 7 Seeing none, we will then begin the 8 public hearing on Case No. WR-2003-0500 in the 9 matter of Missouri-American Water Company's Tariffs 10 to Revise Water and Sewer Rate Schedules. 11 Will counsel make their entries of 12 appearance, please, beginning with staff? MR. SNODGRASS: Yes. Good afternoon, 13 Judge. My name is Cliff Snodgrass. I'm here 14 representing the interests of the Missouri Public 15 16 Service Commission staff today. 17 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Snodgrass, thank 18 you. On behalf of the Office of Public 19 20 Counsel, please. 21 MS. O'NEILL: Yes. Good afternoon. Ruth O'Neill for the Office of Public Counsel and the 22 23 public. JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. O'Neill, thank you. 24 25 On behalf of Missouri-American Water

1 Company, please.

2 MR. CIOTTONE: Your Honor, I'm Richard T. 3 Ciottone, associated with the firm Brydon, 4 Swearengen & England in Jefferson City, and my co-counsel is David Abernathy. He's vice president 5 6 and corporate counsel of the company. 7 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you very much, sir. 8 Any counsel here on behalf of any of the 9 interveners? 10 All right. Seeing none, I will then call the first witness. I see that first witness to be 11 12 called is Gene Pepper. Am I reading that name 13 correctly? MR. PEPPER: Yes. 14 15 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you, sir. If you would, please, approach the podium, 16 17 sir. 18 MR. PEPPER: Good afternoon. 19 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Good afternoon, sir. If I could ask you to raise your right hand to be 20 21 sworn, please. 22 Do you swear the evidence you're about to 23 give will be the truth, the whole truth, and 24 nothing but the truth, so help you God? 25 MR. PEPPER: I do.

1 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you very much, 2 sir. If you would, please state your name for the 3 record and spell your last name. 4 MR. PEPPER: Eugene, E-u-g-e-n-e. And Pepper, P-e - double p - e-r. I'm on everybody's 5 table. And I live at 159 Cedarmill Court, St. 6 Charles County, Missouri 63304. 7 8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: And are you a customer of 9 Missouri-American Water Company? 10 MR. PEPPER: Yes, I am. 11 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right, sir. Any 12 statement you'd like to make? MR. PEPPER: Well, I'm here in objection 13 to this increase that the water company wants. 14 Basically I'm here representing the retired 15 16 community in St. Charles County, for those who 17 can't be here. 18 I'm retired and my income is pretty well set. And these things -- the increases that I get 19 20 keep going up. My taxes went from \$700 a year -- I 21 wrote a check yesterday for 2400 since I moved out 22 here. So I have no way to replace that kind of 23 dollars. I have no way to replace the 2 percent 24 that I lose on my income with the rate of inflation 25 every year.

1 So these increases -- these companies --2 it's always they want an increase. I think that 3 the Missouri-American Water Company is doing 4 sufficiently well in the nine districts that they are proprietors of. So I don't feel that they 5 6 really need a 12 plus percent increase in their gross revenues. That's, based on 2 percent, six 7 8 times the rate of inflation. Based on 3 percent 9 that's, you know, less. So I just can't -- I just 10 can't see it. I don't see why they have to have 11 it.

12 I'm 76 years old. I'm in the over-the-hill gang, you know, and I'm -- I'm where 13 I am today. But if I keep getting these increases 14 and everything, I'm going to be -- I'm going to 15 have problems down the line, because -- as others 16 17 retirees will have. So I think that on the basis 18 of what they want and what they say they need, I think it's just a little bit overzealous on their 19 20 part.

I think that what they're -- what they are getting, based on the return that they're stating -- I believe they get about a 9-1/2 percent return on their equity here in the state. I think that that's doing good. My father was in

1 business. He would have loved to have a 9 percent 2 return on equity but never got that kind anytime. 3 So all in all, I'm here as a citizen, as 4 a consumer, and as a person speaking for myself and other retirees who can't get here for other reasons 5 6 that -- that sounds like the old song, well, the retirees. Well, we are retired and we are on a 7 8 limited income, and I think that those are things 9 that have to be considered for people. 10 So I ask the Commission, in being here, that they look at this and consider the financial 11 12 standing of the company, the good financial 13 standing that the company has, and that they are doing well in this area and that their rates --14 that they just don't get this rate increase. 15 16 That's why I'm here. 17 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Pepper, thank you very much. Let me see if we have any clarifying 18 questions. Do we have any questions from counsel? 19 20 MS. O'NEILL: No, Your Honor. 21 MR. SNODGRASS: None from staff. 22 MR. CIOTTONE: No questions. JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you 23 24 very much. 25 From the Commission. Commissioner

1 Murray, any questions?

2 MS. MURRAY: No questions. Thank you. 3 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Forbis? 4 MR. FORBIS: Thank you for coming. 5 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Pepper, I don't have 6 any questions either. Thank you very much for your 7 time and your remarks. We appreciate it. 8 MR. PEPPER: Thank you for your time. I appreciate it. 9 10 JUDGE PRIDGIN: You're welcome, sir. 11 All right. I see the next witness. And 12 I apologize if I mispronounce their name. Is it 13 Chet Boeke? MR. BOEKE: Yes, it is. 14 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Very good. 15 16 Sir, if you would, please, come to the 17 podium. 18 Did I pronounce that correctly, sir? 19 MR. BOEKE: You did, sir. 20 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you. 21 If you would, sir, please raise your 22 right hand to be sworn. 23 Do you swear the evidence you are about 24 to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and 25 nothing but the truth, so help you God?

1 MR. BOEKE: Absolutely I do. 2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you very much. 3 Sir, if you would, please state your name 4 for the record, and spell your last name, please. 5 MR. BOEKE: My name is Chet, C-h-e-t, 6 Boeke, B-o-e-k-e. Address is 3114 Arrow Rock, like the spelling of arrow, St. Charles, Missouri 63303. 7 8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: And are you a customer of 9 Missouri-American Water Company? 10 MR. BOEKE: Yes, I am. JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any statements you have 11 12 for the Commission, sir? 13 MR. BOEKE: I'm here today to represent numerous individuals in my subdivision; many of 14 these individuals being retired also. 15 16 I'd like to introduce and reference one 17 thing back to the Post-Dispatch article of Sunday, November the 23rd, 2003. On that particular day I 18 read this article about the American Water 19 20 Company. Come to find out that -- it doesn't 21 matter, but it's a German based and owned company. 22 I know they recently bought the larger company, St. Louis County Water Company, which I was kind of 23 24 surprised at the time; I thought the smaller outfit 25 buying the larger one. And I also used to live in

St. Louis County, and I realized that has a lot of
 old piping and infrastructure and may eventually
 create a lot of costs for the company.

4 But, you know, I'm a small businessman, and naturally I look at costs, current and future 5 6 costs. And I didn't know if that was a wise move, but it wasn't certainly my job to really worry 7 8 about their acquiring other companies. But having 9 been in the world a few years, danced on the face 10 of this world, I realized that, you know, naturally there's always some way to come back and bite you 11 12 sooner or later, including in their situation. 13 It doesn't look like much when you see a 12.2. That was the letter I got from the water 14 15 company, a potential 12.2 increase. Post-Dispatch

16 had that they was going to increase 10.75. No.
17 Wait. I'm sorry.

They wanted a larger increase anyway. 18 The point being, everything's increasing day by 19 day, week by week, month by month, and it does add 20 21 up. All this pay adds up. You know, I wish the 22 government would learn this. Businesses generally 23 have different -- limited to recoup their money. Fortunately in Missouri we have public counsel and 24 25 other entities that hopefully watch and ride the

1 waves so they don't get too tall.

2 The problem I see here -- I'm a small 3 water user. I know we have businesses out here 4 that have high uses. And if I'm not incorrect, my past knowledge, high users of water being large 5 6 companies, say plating companies or things of this nature, would use a lot of water. Therefore, 7 8 they're subsidized, I think, by the smaller 9 people. They get a quite a bit lower rate for 10 1,000 or however many cubic feet of water you use. I adamantly oppose this on the basis that 11 we're at about a 2 percent cost inflation in this 12 country right now. I think 12 percent -- 12.2 is 13 way too much. I think half of that is way too 14 much. And I believe that the company return, as I 15 read in the Post-Dispatch article, has about a 10.3 16 percent profit margin. I think that's pretty 17 18 sufficient, because when you add it up to the number of customers and their new inquiries --19 acquisitions -- I'm sorry -- I think they're doing 20 21 very well. I think anything over about a 3 percent 22 increase would be abusive to the customer. I might add, it doesn't hurt to try. I 23 24 was a union negotiator at times. And obviously you 25 ask for twice as much and hope for half as much,

and whatever you settle out is, you know, the way business usually goes. But I'll submit to you that this is unnecessary. They haven't proven it to me. I think they need to look at a step plan for higher users of water and charge them what they should charge them all along. I think they've been carrying them, having a break for quite some time.

8 In closing off, I adamantly stand on the 9 position that I feel that they don't need this type 10 of increase. Everybody wants an increase. Maybe needs an increase. At this point I feel that they 11 12 need to review and justify to the public counsel 13 and the Commission what really is needed. It looks like to me it might be a decrease. And nobody ever 14 wants to hear that. You know, I don't want to hear 15 it. But, you know, I can't charge my customers --16 17 if I made a mistake on the last job, I can't charge 18 them more on their job to make up for it. 19 You know, I don't know if their infrastructure in St. Louis County is a situation 20 21 where they didn't anticipate the kind of costs 22 they're going to have. But according to the

23 article, you know, we've got an acquisition

25

24 adjustment now that apparently became law last year

in the state of Missouri. In the paper the article

says that St. Louis County and the St. Louis area
 is going to get an especially large increase.
 Well, that's for them to come out and fight, you
 know. Somehow we shouldn't have to --

I'll try to close this off, but we 5 6 shouldn't have to subsidize it. Two years ago I 7 was here. I was one of the lead speakers 8 downstairs. I believe it was approximately two years ago. We had 3 to 400 people show up. They 9 10 were asking for an astronomical -- astronomical increase. I don't recall what it was. It should 11 have stuck in my mind, but it didn't. But we were 12 down there for hours. You know, there's not many 13 14 people here today because it's 12 o'clock. But I 15 assure you, I think the interest is here in St. Charles County. It was at the last -- two years 16 17 ago, last hearing.

And what we come to find out is they was wanting to charge us, in St. Charles County, basically, customers, to build some out state -- I think St. Joseph water infrastructure or something out there. I mean, this -- it can't work that way. We use it here. Let's do it here, the cost of what it costs here.

So therefore, I feel that we need to

1 absolutely contain this, review it, and come down 2 to an absolute true cost and profit. Thank you. 3 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Boeke, thank you very 4 much for your remarks. Let me see if we have, 5 first, any clarifying questions from counsel. 6 MS. O'NEILL: No, Your Honor. 7 MR. SNODGRASS: None from staff, Judge. 8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. 9 MR. CIOTTONE: No questions. 10 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you very much. Let me see if we have any questions from the 11 12 Commission. Commissioner Murray? 13 MS. MURRAY: Mr. Boeke, as a former colleague of mine in the House of Representatives, 14 it's good to see you again. 15 16 MR. BOEKE: I recognized you. 17 MS. MURRAY: I wanted to ask you, are you a business -- small business customer of 18 19 Missouri-American Water? MR. BOEKE: No. I'm a small 20 21 businessman. I'm just trying to refer my business concepts to a larger business concept as far as 22 23 profitability. 24 MS. MURRAY: Okay. So you --25 MR. BOEKE: Because I have to be

1 competitive. You know, I have competitors out 2 there in my type of business, and I have to review 3 their charges every year, so I -- you know, and 4 keep a -- maintain a certain amount of business. But, you know, we have telephone company, electric, 5 6 water, and so on and so forth, you know, sewers. 7 You know, I bring somewhat, I feel, bitter 8 experiences with me to St. Charles County -- I've 9 lived out here a number of years -- from St. Louis 10 County where MSD wasn't checked and balanced 11 properly. And I can assure you, them people should 12 have been looked at criminally, in my opinion, for 13 what they were doing, the way they mismanaged their money over there. Of course I'm not inferring or 14 referring that to this company, because I think 15 16 it's probably a pretty well run company. 17 MS. MURRAY: But you are -- you are a customer as a residential customer? 18 MR. BOEKE: Yes. 19 MS. MURRAY: Okay. And I think I heard 20 you say that you recommend or prefer a rate design 21 22 that charges more as the usage goes up; is that 23 correct? 24 MR. BOEKE: For the large companies. 25 Like plating companies and stuff run water 24 hours

1 a day, and they get a break. You know, I 2 understand volume in some businesses usually gets a 3 lower rate, because they probably couldn't stay in business maybe, I'm assuming, if they had the same 4 rate. But you can't keep subsidizing certain 5 6 entities. And maybe that needs to be reviewed. You know, we're becoming a larger industrial area 7 8 out here. I don't know how much water usage would 9 be connected to that, but, you know, just as an 10 idea. 11 Like I said, a plating company or something that runs water very continuous, you 12 13 know, uses large volumes of water. They obviously 14 get it considerably cheaper. I mean, I notice when 15 I water my grass just normally and reasonably, the water then peaks up pretty considerable. I'm 16 talking about not day and night. I'm talking a few 17 hours here and there. 18 MS. MURRAY: Thank you. 19 MR. BOEKE: You're welcome. 20 21 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Murray, thank you. 22 Commissioner Forbis? MR. FORBIS: Okay. I want to focus just 23 24 on one thing you said. You mentioned that you 25 thought anything over a 3 percent increase would be

1 excessive. I heard you say that. Are you talking 2 about a 3 percent increase in the monthly bill, not 3 --

4 MR. BOEKE: Correct.

MR. FORBIS: Okay. A 3 percent increase 5 in the amount that you're charged every month? 6 7 MR. BOEKE: Well, I believe the 12.6 8 percent or anywhere near that is really ridiculous, 9 even though it sounds a reasonably good package. 10 When you say it's only like 1.78 an average customer, that doesn't sound like much. But, you 11 12 know, just like I told these people recently, the 13 cell phone company now, when I send a check in to them, charges an extra 90 cents to wire my check 14 15 in. Now that's something new that I'm looking at, 16 too. You know, 90 cents times several million 17 customers adds up to some real profitability. And I'm afraid other utilities might start going by 18 that, charging users to send a check in to pay the 19 20 bill.

21 MR. FORBIS: I'm just curious, just for 22 my own benefit, have you been pretty pleased with 23 the -- you kind of alluded to earlier the quality 24 of service. Do you have any issues, customer 25 service or otherwise, with the company?

1 MR. BOEKE: No.

2 MR. FORBIS: Okay. 3 MR. BOEKE: You know, they -- they've 4 recently -- I understand that they've been upgrading our systems out here, which I'm not aware 5 6 of. But our systems are getting older. I know one 7 thing they are starting to offer, which people 8 should possibly consider, would be insurance. You 9 know, the main that goes right between your house. 10 Because I'm sure after something gets 30 or 40 11 years old like that, it could be 3 or \$4,000. And 12 it's something that they have pushed. And I don't 13 know what the profitability would be on that, but, you know, you've got to look at the overall 14 profitability and not try to get it in just one 15 16 area. 17 MR. FORBIS: All right. Thank you. MR. BOEKE: You're welcome. 18 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Boeke, thank you very 19 20 much for your time and your remarks today. 21 MR. BOEKE: Thank you. 22 JUDGE PRIDGIN: We appreciate it. 23 I don't see any other witnesses signed 24 up. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify? 25 All right. I see no volunteers.

1 Let me see if we have any closing remarks 2 from the Commission. Commissioner Murray? 3 MS. MURRAY: No. Thank you. 4 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you. 5 Commissioner Forbis? 6 MR. FORBIS: I would just thank the two 7 people who came here to speak today. Mr. Pepper 8 had to leave. Thank you, Mr. Boeke, for coming. 9 JUDGE PRIDGIN: And I, likewise, would 10 like to thank the witnesses. We appreciate your remarks. And again, the other commissioners who 11 12 are not here this afternoon will read your remarks 13 and will take them into consideration. 14 Do I see anything else from counsel? All right. Seeing nothing, we will then 15 16 conclude this hearing. Thank you very much. This hearing is now concluded, and we are off the 17 18 record. 19 (Hearing concluded.) 20 21 22 23 24 25