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-2010-0131

<u>MAWC RESPONSE TO</u> ORDER REGARDING CUSTOMER NOTICES

Comes now Missouri-American Water Company (MAWC or Company) and, as its Motion to Consolidate, states as follows to the Missouri Public Service Commission (Commission):

1. On January 21, 2010, the Commission issued its Order Regarding Customer

Notices. In that order, the Commission identified specific customer hearing notices for

MAWC's water and sewer customers. The Commission further directed that "any party

objecting to [the Commission's language shall file suggestions to amend such language no later than January 29, 2010."

PROPOSED ADDITION TO FORMS OF NOTICE

2. MAWC does not object to the language proposed by the Commission. However, it does believe that one addition to that language would provide helpful and necessary information to its customers.

3. The Commission forms of notice, among other things, specified the overall revenue requirement increase sought by MAWC in this case in terms of both dollars and percentage. This information, while correct, does not help a customer identify effects on his or her district. Because MAWC has proposed that its rates continue to be set be set separately for

each district, the customer impact of the rates proposed by MAWC necessarily differ from district to district.

4. Accordingly, MAWC would propose to add a sentence to each customer notice containing information pertaining to the proposed increase for the average residential customer in that district. The proposed sentence would read as follows for *water* customers:

For the typical **[district]** residential customer using **x** gallons per [month] [quarter], the proposed increase would be approximately **\$xx.xx** per [month] [quarter], if this rate request is approved in full.

MAWC would propose to use the following sentence for *sewer* customers: For a **[district]** residential customer, the proposed increase would be **\$xx.xx** per month, if this rate request is approved in full.

5. Attached hereto as **Appendix A** is a spreadsheet containing the rate information that would be used to complete each district's notice. MAWC believes that this additional information would allow customers to better assess the proposed impact on their individual district and bill.

TIMING

6. The most cost efficient method of providing the subject notice to customers is to provide the notices along with a normal MAWC bill. In this situation, there is no additional envelope or postage associated with the notice.

7. However, in order to provide customer notices at least ten days and not more than forty-five days before the local public hearings in this case, MAWC will already be required to direct mail notices to more than half of MAWC's customers in its St. Louis district because those

2

customers are billed on a ninety day/quarterly cycle. MAWC would like to minimize the number of other direct customer mailings it must make

8. Given the current schedule with the first hearing tentatively set for as early as March 29, 2010, and in order to utilize an entire billing cycle within the designated period in the monthly billed districts, MAWC would need to start the mailings on February 17, 2010. If MAWC provides the notice to the printer on February 10, 2010, that gives the printer seven days to deliver the inserts that must start on February 17, 2010. Accordingly, MAWC asks that the Commission provide its decision in regard to the form of notice and an order regarding local hearing dates, times and locations by February 9, 2010, so that timely notice may be provided in the most cost effective means available.

WHEREFORE, MAWC requests the Commission issue its order establishing the form of customer to be that previously identified by the Commission with the addition of the sentence proposed herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Aller-

William R. England, III MBE#23975 Dean L. Cooper Mo. Bar 36592 BRYDON, SWEARENGEN & ENGLAND P.C. 312 East Capitol Avenue P.O. Box 456 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456 Telephone: (573) 635-7166 Facsimile: (573) 635-0427 trip@brydonlaw.com dcooper@brydonlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR MISSOURI-AMERICAN

WATER COMPANY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been sent by electronic mail this 29th day of January, 2010, to:

Jennifer Hernandez General Counsel's Office Missouri Public Service Commission Governor's Office Building 200 Madison Street P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 Jennifer.hernandez@psc.mo.gov

Stuart W. Conrad, Esq. David L. Woodsmall Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson, L.C. 1209 Penntower Office Center 3100 Broadway Kansas City, Missouri 64111 <u>stucon@fcplaw.com</u>

Leland B. Curtis Curtis, Heinz, Garret & O'Keefe, P.C. 130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200 Clayton, MO 63105 Icurtis@lawfirmemail.com

Lisa C. Langeneckert Sandberg Phoenix, et al. One City Centre, Suite 1500 515 North Sixth Street St. Louis, MO 63101-1880 <u>llangeneckert@sandbergphoenix.com</u> Christina Baker Office of the Public Counsel Governor's Office Building 200 Madison Street P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 christina.baker@ded.mo.gov

Sherrie A. Schroder Michael A. Evans Hammond and Shinners, P.C. 7730 Carondelet Ave., Suite 200 St. Louis, MO 63105 saschroder@hammondshinners.com mevans@hammondshiners.com

Terry C. Allen Allen Law Offices, LLC 612 E . Capitol Ave, PO 1702 Jefferson City, MO 65102 terry@tcallenlawoffices.com

Q1.Com