Exhibit No.:

Issues: Operations, Quality of Service,

Construction Projects, Rate Adjustment, Plant in Service

Witness:

James A. Merciel, Jr.

Sponsoring Party:

MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit:

Surrebuttal Testimony

Case No.:

WR-2007-0216

Date Testimony Prepared:

July 31, 2007

# MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

· OF

JAMES A. MERCIEL, JR.

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

CASE NO. WR-2007-0216, et al.

Exhibit No.

Date & IR

Rptr\_

Jefferson City, Missouri July 2007

STAFF-16

## **BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

# OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Missouri-American Water ) Company's request for Authority to ) Implement a General Rate Increase for ) Water Service provided in Missouri ) Service Areas )	Case No. WR-2007-0216
AFFIDAVIT OF JAMES A. MERCIEL, JR.	
STATE OF MISSOURI ) ) ss COUNTY OF COLE )	
James A. Merciel, Jr., of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the following Surrebuttal Testimony in question and answer form consisting of pages of Surrebuttal Testimony to be presented in the above case that the answers in the following Surrebuttal Testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.	
James A. Merciel, Jr.  Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30 <sup>th</sup> day of July, 2007.	
D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri County of Cole My Commission Exp. 07/01/2008	Musullankin Notary Public
My commission expires July 1	2008_

### 1 SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF 2 JAMES A. MERCIEL, JR. 3 MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY CASE NO. WR-2007-0216, et al. 5 6 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY...... NEW SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITIES ......1 8 10

SUMMARY......5

11

#### SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY 1 2 OF 3 JAMES A. MERCIEL, JR. 4 MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY 5 CASE NO. WR-2007-0216, et al. INTRODUCTION 6 7 Q. Please state your name and business address. 8 A. James A. Merciel, Jr., P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102. 9 Q. Are you the same James A. Merciel, Jr. who provided Direct testimony in this 10 case? 11 A. Yes. 12 **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** 13 Q. What is the purpose of your Surrebuttal testimony? 14 A. To rebut testimony with regard to investment in new sewage treatment 15 facilities that was filed by Alan J. DeBoy and James M. Jenkins; water storage tank design 16 that was filed by Alan J. DeBoy; and considerations with repairs and construction involving 17 asbestos-cement pipe that was filed by Alan Ratermann. 18 **NEW SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITIES** 19 Q. What sewage treatment facilities, and what issue, are you addressing? 20 A. The Company has constructed new/expanded facilities in its Cedar Hill service 21 area in Jefferson County, and at both plant locations in its Warren County service area,

serving in and around the subdivision known as Incline Village. I addressed these facilities in

22

Direct testimony, and recommended disallowance from this case of all of the expanded Cedar Hill facility, and 60% of the Warren County facilities.

- Q. What is the reason for your proposed disallowance?
- A. The reason for the disallowance is to prevent current customers from paying for plant that is not needed for them, but rather is needed for future customers.
- Q. Do you believe that the plant facilities were inappropriately constructed, or that they should be permanently removed from the plant in service accounts?
- A. No, I do not believe the plants were inappropriately or imprudently constructed, and stated so in Direct testimony. I generally agree with Mr. Jenkin's and Mr. DeBoy's comments with regard to the level of plant that the Company constructed.

In the case of Warren County, the expanded facilities are desperately needed both for existing customers and future customers who own property and have been waiting on capacity in order to construct new homes, as well as a more uncertain level of customers who will need service within the next, say, seven or eight years. Further, the previous owner of the Warren County system was a regulated company that was in receivership, and new, competent ownership was indeed needed when Missouri-American Water Co. stepped in and acquired the assets of that company.

In the case of Cedar Hill, the previous owner of that system was a family that was interested in divesting itself of utility ownership, and while new ownership was not so desperate, it was desirable. The new plant is needed to serve developments within the service area that are in need of service.

I have no desire to discourage the Company from acquiring systems such as this and constructing appropriate improvements, and in fact this activity should be positively

2

1

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

12

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22 encouraged. However, I believe that existing customers should not bear the entire cost of projects that increase capacity by approximately double, because it is needed for future customer. I do believe that the Company should be able to recover the cost of the plant, but that recovery should be from the future customers.

#### WATER STORAGE TANK

- Q. Which new water storage tank is being addressed?
- A. The new water storage tank is located in the Warren County service area, and similar to the sewer facilities, it is largely needed for existing customers.
- Q. Do you have a difference of opinion with the Company with regard to this tank?
- A. No, I believe that the difference has been resolved. Originally, I recommended a disallowance based on capacity needed for existing customers, however, Mr. DeBoy correctly points out that I did not include volume for fire protection. I agree that it is reasonable to include such a volume.

Mr. DeBoy studies the needed volume of this tank based on equalization volume for peak hour flow, peak hour meaning extremely high demand by customers during certain times of each day such as wake-up time in the morning, and early evening after customers come home from work and have supper and do activities around the house that involve water use. I, on the other hand, studied this system from the standpoint that there is only one well serving as the only source of supply, and therefore it is good practice to have adequate storage volume available for one average-day use, because it is about a day-long job to replace a well pump. The bottom line, however, is that either method of studying necessary tank volume gives

approximately the same result in this situation, and I consider the tank volume to be reasonable, and I am no longer recommending a disallowance.

#### **ASBESTOS-CEMENT PIPE**

## Q. Can you describe what Asbestos-Cement pipe is?

A. Yes. Asbestos-Cement, sometimes abbreviated as AC pipe, and also sometimes known by the name "transite," was one type of pipe used for both water and sewer pipelines primarily in the 1950's and 1960's, as well as other applications. Since asbestos is considered a hazardous material, its use has been highly discouraged in more recent years. It is made using portland cement, with asbestos fibers as reinforcement.

- Q. As a hazardous material, are special procedures necessary when working with AC pipe while working on the water system?
- A. Yes. Pipeline work itself is done substantially in the conventional manner, except cutting should be done wet, so as to prevent or minimize airborne asbestos particles. Precautions for worker safety, primarily breathing protection, need to be employed. Sawdust and cuttings need to be captured, and along with any removed pipe or pieces, need to handled and disposed of in an appropriate manner as hazardous material.
- Q. Are you aware of written procedures, or courses that pertain to this type of work?
- A. I am not aware of specific procedures or courses from likely central sources, such as the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, or the American Water Works Association. There is information from various sources on the internet.

ĩ

Q. Do you agree with Mr. Ratermann that the Company's employees should be trained in working with AC pipe?

A. To the extent that they need to work with AC pipe, yes, I agree that the Company should provide appropriate training, if it is not doing so. I was not previously aware that AC pipe was in use in what I call the St. Louis County Water Company system, though there could be a small amount, and I don't know how much is in use in the various municipal and water district systems that the Company has acquired.

#### **SUMMARY**

- Q. Would you please summarize your Surrebuttal testimony?
- A. Yes. I believe that, from a practical standpoint, adjustments are needed for the major capital improvements in the Warren County and Cedar Hill service areas with regard to sewage treatment facilities, since the projects are massive and are necessary for a substantial amount of customer growth. I no longer have an issue with the water tank in the Warren County service area. To the extent the Company's employees need to work with asbestoscement pipe, I agree that training and education is reasonable if the Company is not already doing so.
  - Q. Does this conclude your Surrebuttal testimony at this time?
  - A. Yes.