

Exhibit No.:
Issue(s): Lobbying Expense
Promotional Expense
Witness: Courtney Barron
Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony
Case No.: WR-2020-0344
Date Testimony Prepared: January 15, 2021

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FINANCIAL AND BUSINESS ANALYSIS DIVISION

AUDITING DEPARTMENT

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

COURTNEY BARRON

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

CASE NO. WR-2020-0344

Jefferson City, Missouri
January 2021

**** Denotes Confidential Information ****

1 **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

2 **OF**

3 **COURTNEY BARRON**

4 **MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY**

5 **CASE NO. WR-2020-0344**

6 Q. Please state your name and business address.

7 A. Courtney Barron, 200 Madison Street, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.

8 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

9 A. I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) as
10 a Utility Regulatory Auditor in the Auditing Department, Financial and Business Analysis
11 Division.

12 Q. Are you the same Courtney Barron that contributed to Staff’s Cost of Service
13 Report (“Report”) filed on November 24, 2020, in Case No. WR-2020-0344?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?

16 A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to describe changes made to
17 Staff’s position regarding lobbying and promotional expense.

18 **LOBBYING EXPENSE**

19 Q. Has Staff made any modifications or corrections to its position on
20 lobbying expense?

21 A. Yes. Staff made one modification and one correction. After reviewing
22 Missouri American Water Company’s (“MAWC”) response to Midwest Energy
23 Consumers Group Data Request No. 2-0022, Staff has excluded a portion of the

1 employee expenses incurred by ** _____
2 _____ ** (based on her percentage of time spent on lobbying) which Staff had not previously
3 reviewed. In the Report, Staff also inadvertently labeled ** _____
4 _____
5 _____ **. Staff corrected these job
6 titles.

7 **PROMOTIONAL EXPENSE**

8 Q. Has Staff made any modifications to its position on promotional expense?

9 A. Yes. There have been two modifications. First, Office of Public Counsel witness
10 Amanda Conner proposed to disallow an employee award promotional item. Staff agrees with
11 Ms. Conner's adjustment regarding the promotional item since Staff also disallowed all
12 employee awards in their rebuttal promotional expense workpaper and Staff included this
13 additional adjustment in their rebuttal workpaper. Second, Staff identified some promotional
14 items that were originally allowed in Staff's direct workpaper but, upon further analysis, do not
15 provide a direct benefit to the ratepayers and are not necessary for the provision of safe and
16 adequate utility service to its customers. Those items include MAWC ** _____
17 _____ **. Staff's
18 current total adjustment for promotional expense is -\$37,160, changed from Staff's previous
19 position of -\$31,428.

20 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

21 A. Yes, it does.

