

Dear Sir:

April 15, 2002

We received a letter informing us that the KMB Utility Corporation submitted a request to raise their rates under the MO Public Service Commission small company rate increase procedure.

We moved into Cedar Hill Estates in Sept of 2002, selling our homestead in Franklin County after 48 years. My husband and I are both retired, and on fixed incomes and we both feel the rate hike proposed is extremely exhorbitant. A 123% increase should not be allowed. I have no qualms about our water being metered, which is what the water company is doing at the present time, but I resent very much this huge increase in fees.

Also, the charge for a new service line is over a 300% increase and this should not be allowed.

My husband and I are completely against this huge increase in rates.

Sincerely,

*Mrs. Edwin D. Tenny*

Mr. and Mrs. Edwin D. Tenny  
# 49 Cedar Hill Estates,  
Cedar Hill MO 63016-2224  
636-285-7055

APR 18 2003



# Hobbs Chapel United Methodist Church

Rev. James V. (Jim) Hogue, Ph.D. • Pastor  
3024 State Highway 177 • Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

**FILE COPY**

April 21, 2003

Office of the Public Counsel  
ATTN: Ruth O'Neill  
P. O. Box 7800  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Dear Ms O'Neill:

I have just received the notice regarding a proposed rate increase for KMB Utilities. I must protest this increase. Hobbs Chapel owns a home, soon to be the former parsonage, in the Cape Rock Village subdivision, and is serviced by KMB. Due to the parsonage not being used as a parsonage prior to my arrival, no one was aware that there was a sewer bill separate from the water bill for several months. When we discovered the error, I made contact with KMB. I was met by rudeness and a complete lack of willingness to assist my paying the back balance.

What I requested, which I was told firmly on more than one occasion by the office manager at KMB was unavailable, was a breakdown, by month, of charges, including late charges and interest. I was given a figure which included a past due from a tenant prior to my arrival, and every effort I made to clarify the bill was met with a refusal to supply information. I admit that from approximately March 2002 until September 2002, when I was trying to have basic questions answered, I was aware of the amount due but did not pay the entire amount off. Despite KMB's refusal to supply information (they never complied with my requests fully), I did pay the entire amount in September. I requested, at that time and several times since, a receipt showing that I had paid the amount past due from when I moved in as well as the amount owed by another party. KMB refused, stating that they did not have those records. This statement was made more than once by Vicki Amsden in telephone conversations in August, September, and October 2002.

My point for this lengthy history is that if KMB is unable or unwilling to supply basic documentation to its customers, they ought not be granted a rate increase. Their financial difficulties are, in all probability, due to their own mismanagement. I would wonder if a thorough investigation of their books would reveal their management problems. I am already paying more than I ever have, anywhere in the country, for water and sewer combined and do not feel there is sufficient service provided to the customer to warrant further increases.

Sincerely,

James V. Hogue

jh

cc: Missouri Public Service Commission

April 15, 2003

Office of the Public Council  
ATTN: Ruth O'Neill  
P.O. Box 7800  
Jefferson City, Mo. 65102

FILE 007

David C. Wilson  
76 Cedar Hill Estates  
Cedar Hill, Mo. 63016-2223  
(636) 274-1309

Ms. O'Neill,

This letter is a commentary in response to the Consumer Impact Statement dated April 11, 2003 by Cedar Hill Water Company, Inc. 5108 Dulin Creek Rd, House Springs, Mo. 63051 apparently on behalf of KMB Utility Corporation regarding a request for permanent increase in its current water rates, under the Missouri Public Service Commission's small company rate increase procedure.

Regarding their rate increase proposal, I will comment on each item in the order it was presented in their letter.

- (1)-(3) The Late Payment Charge is to be modified;
  - (2) A \$20.00 charge for Bad Checks is in line with other businesses in this area so I see nothing wrong with this item.
  - (3) I feel the Door Collection Charges are not out of line either due to the fact that I have been aware of individuals who, not only don't pay their bills, but avoid those trying to confront them about it.
- (4)-(6) I find these three Charge Tables to be ambiguous in nature and open to misinterpretation and possible misuse.
  - (4) Most systems that I am familiar with have Shut Off Valves at the meter that the customer can operate themselves without the necessity of Water Company involvement. This allows for repairs or general maintenance to be performed without additional costs to the customer.
  - (5) Does this Reconnecting Charge apply to Item (4) above which now would cost the customer \$75.00 for help from this Public Service Provider, or is it an inflated charge to simply turn a valve back on for someone who has already paid the Back Charges owed the Water Company in order to get their service reinstated. I feel in case No.1 this charge would be totally out of line and in case No. 2 it is excessive.
  - (6) Item No. 4 has already implemented a Turn Off charge and yet here's

APR 17 2003

another one for seemingly the same situation which takes the opportunity to add additional fees.

Again, I must say that these Three Paragraphs need closer examination, clarification and most certainly adjustments.

- (7) I feel this charge for Meter Testing is Totally out of line. Why should the consumer pay to have equipment checked that belongs to the Service Provider which said Provider uses in his Business Operations. I haven't paid to get the Gas Pumps or the Electric Meter Calibrated, to mention only two similar situations, so why in the name of common sense and fairness should I be required to pay for the Water Company Good Maintenance Practices.
- (8) This New Service Connection is understandable in the case of a New Home construction but does not address the issue of Mobil Homes with-in a Mobil Home Park, which is my case. The water service we have was already in place except for the meters that have recently been installed which I feel is not my responsibility to pay for. The meters are a way to generate income for the Water Company and should be considered a Cost of Doing Business Expense not an addition to the Water Bill I will be receiving.
- (9) I feel no need in responding to this item due to the fact that it has been covered in (4); (5) and (6) already.

As far as the Overall Rate Increases proposed, I find it hard to believe that the Commission would even consider an increase ranging from 87% to 165% at one time. No private company could institute such high increases in the Selling Price of their product without loosing every customer they have. I beg you to consider this request carefully, what is being proposed is an Increase that could only be successful in a Monopoly Situation where the Consumer has no other source of service.

I'm not opposed to Reasonable Return on Investment, that's what keeps business afloat, I am not, however, in favor of a Public Service Provider manipulating the system solely for their Financial Gain without consideration as to the affect it will have on their consumers because the customers have no real recourse.

Thank You for your time in considering my comments and I pray that you will look deeply into the points that I have brought up and reach a fair and equitable resolution for All Parties concerned.

  
David C. Wilson