FILED March 27, 2025 Data Center Missouri Public Service Commission

Exhibit No. 224

Staff – Exhibit 224 Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson Cross-Rebuttal/Surrebuttal File No. WR-2024-0320

Exhibit No.: Issue(s): Normalized Residential Customer Usage & Declining Residential Customer Usage Jarrod J. Robertson Witness: MoPSC Staff Sponsoring Party: *Type of Exhibit:* Cross-Rebuttal/Surrebuttal Testimony WR-2024-0320 Case No.: Date Testimony Prepared: January 10, 2025

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION

WATER, SEWER, GAS, & STEAM DEPARTMENT

CROSS-REBUTTAL/SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JARROD J. ROBERTSON

MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

CASE NO. WR-2024-0320

Jefferson City, Missouri January 2025

1		CROSS-REBUTTAL/SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		JARROD J. ROBERTSON
4		MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
5		CASE NO. WR-2024-0320
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
7	А.	My name is Jarrod J. Robertson, and I am employed as Commission Staff
8	("Staff") by t	he Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission"), located at the Governor
9	Office Buildi	ng, Suite 500, 200 Madison Street, P.O. Box 306, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.
10	Q.	Are you the same Jarrod J. Robertson that filed Direct-Rebuttal Testimony in this
11	case on Dece	mber 6, 2024.
12	А.	Yes, I am.
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your Cross-Rebuttal/Surrebuttal testimony?
14	А.	The purpose of this testimony is to address an error located within the workpaper
15	that correspo	nds to my Direct-Rebuttal Testimony, "WR-2025-0320 Normalization-Declining
16	Usage FILIN	G," and to provide associated revisions to the residential customer usage per day
17	figures for Di	strict #2 (All Other), as well as revisions to data related to the residential customer
18	usage trend	comparison between Staff and Missouri American Water Company, Inc., LLC
19	("MAWC").	
20	Q.	What is the error within the workpaper you would like to address?
21	А.	Previously, in order to calculate average monthly customer counts on a per system
22	basis, I had o	livided all annual totals within the "Avg Customer Count/Month Calendar Year"
23	column by 12	2, but not all systems have 12 months of data for each annual/calendar year data
24	point. So, w	ithin the first tab, "Usage & Cust. Count" of the workpaper, I adjusted all systems

Cross-Rebuttal/Surrebuttal Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson

"Avg Customer Count/Month Calendar Year" column's data to represent the correct monthly
 average for each annual data point, by dividing the annual/calendar year total by the correct
 number of months/data points.

- What are the results of this revision? 4 Q. 5 A. The results of this revision have been provided in Schedule JJR-crs1. 6 Q. As a result of this revision, are there any other items you would like to address? 7 Yes. As a result of revisions to the residential monthly customer counts, the data A. 8 presented in the "Usage Trend Comparison" tab of Staff's workpaper, "WR-2025-0320 9 Normalization-Declining Usage FILING" has changed, and those results can be viewed in the 10 following table, Table A, which presents a comparison of residential customer usage between 11 Staff and MAWC, on an annual residential customer usage volumetric scale:
- 12

Table A					
Tariff District 1					
А	В	С	D	E	F
		Total Annual Decline in		Total Annual \$	Total Annua \$ Per
	Annually	Usage	Units	(Column D/1000)	Customer
Staff 5yr Res. Avg Decline/Customer (Actuals)	-1,407	(1,407*319,003) = 448,837,221	448,837,221*7.7604	-\$3,483,156.37	-\$10.92
Co. Predicted 10yr Res. Avg Decline/Customer	-1,000	(1,000*322,271) = 322,271,000	322,271,000*7.7604	-\$2,500,951.87	-\$7.76
	-407		-	\$982,204.50	-\$3.16
Tariff District 2					
А	В	с	D	E	F
		Total Annual		Total Annual \$	Total Annual \$ Per
	Annually	Increrase/Decline in Usage	Units	(Column D/1000)	Customer
Staff 5yr Res. Avg DECREASE/Customer (Actuals	-431	(431*116,727) = 50,309,337	50,309,337*8.3781	-\$421,496.00	-\$3.23
Co. Predicted 10yr Res. Avg Decline/Customer	-600	(600*119,281) = 71,568,600	71,568,600*8.3781	-\$599,608.89	-\$5.03
	-169		-	\$178,112.89	-\$1.80

13

14

15

Q. What do the revised comparisons in Table A between Staff and MAWC's calculations show?

A. There were no changes to Tariff District 1 data. The resulting calculations related
to the amount of decline in residential water consumption on an annual scale, and the impact of
each in dollars, was unchanged for District 1. See bullet points below for a summary of the data:

1	• Tariff District 1;
2	• Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of
3	\sim 1,407 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale;
4	 This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a
5	decrease in annual revenues of ~\$3,483,156,369;
6	• This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$10.92 less in
7	revenue per customer annually.
8	• Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an
9	annual decrease of ~1,000 gallons on a per residential customer
10	usage scale;
11	• This decrease in annual usage equates to a decrease in annual
12	revenues of ~\$2,500,951,868;
13	• This decrease in annual revenues equates to ~\$7.76 less in
14	revenue per customer annually.
15	• Regarding Tariff District 1, the difference between Staff and MAWC on an annual
16	dollar scale is \sim \$982,204,501, and \sim \$3.16 less per customer in annual revenue.
17	The resulting calculations and comparison related to the outlined revisions for District 2 are
10	
18	as follows:
18 19	 Tariff District 2;
19	• Tariff District 2;
19 20	 Tariff District 2; O Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of
19 20 21	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale;
19 20 21 22	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a
19 20 21 22 23	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496;
19 20 21 22 23 24	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale;
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual revenues of ~\$599,608,887;
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual revenues of ~\$599,608,887; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$5.03 less in
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual revenues of ~\$599,608,887; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$5.03 less in revenue per customer annually.
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual revenues of ~\$599,608,887; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$5.03 less in revenue per customer annually. Regarding Tariff District 2, the difference between Staff and MAWC on an annual
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual revenues of ~\$599,608,887; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$5.03 less in revenue per customer annually.
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual revenues of ~\$599,608,887; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$5.03 less in revenue per customer annually. Regarding Tariff District 2, the difference between Staff and MAWC on an annual
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 	 Tariff District 2; Utilizing its five (5) year average, Staff calculated an annual decrease of ~431 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual residential customer usage equates to a decrease in annual revenues of ~\$421,496; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$3.23 less in revenue per customer annually. Utilizing its ten (10) year linear regression analysis, MAWC calculated an annual decrease of ~600 gallons on a per residential customer usage scale; This decrease in annual revenues of ~\$599,608,887; This decrease in annual revenues equates to \$5.03 less in revenue per customer annually. Regarding Tariff District 2, the difference between Staff and MAWC on an annual

Cross-Rebuttal/Surrebuttal Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson

1	Q. Are there any other items you would like to address?					
2	A. Yes. The revisions previously outlined create a change to the District 2 ("D2")					
3	residential customer usage on a gallons per day basis presented in "Table II" from my					
4	direct-rebuttal testimony. Those corrections for D2 are in Table B below:					
5						
	<u>D1</u> <u>D2</u>					
	Per Day Per Day					
	2023 207.0702 2023 154.6963					
	2022 206.2013 2022 154.9141					
	2021 200.9525 2021 152.4711 2020 211 2020 115 5115					
	2020 211.3091 2020 155.5115 2019 197.9667 2019 144.5376					
6	2019 197.9007 2019 144.5570					
7	• D1 (unchanged)					
8	• This data displays an increase per day per residential customer usage for					
9	Tariff District 1 for three (3) out of the four (4) possible data points from					
10	2019 through 2023;					
11	• $2019 - 2020 = +13.34$ gallons per day;					
12	• $2020 - 2021 = -10.35$ gallons per day.					
13	• $2021 - 2022 = +5.24$ gallons per day;					
14	= 2021 - 2022 = +5.24 gallons per day, $= 2022 - 2023 = +0.88 gallons per day.$					
11	2022 2023 (0.00 guiloits por day.					
15	• D2					
16	• This data displays an increase in per day residential customer usage for					
17	Tariff District 2 for two (2) out of the four (4) possible data points from					
18	2019 through 2023;					
19	5					
20	2019 2020 · 10.97 guilons per duy,					
	• $2020 - 2021 = -3.04$ gallons per day;					
21	• $2021 - 2022 = +2.44$ gallons per day;					
22	• $2022 - 2023 = -0.21$ gallons per day.					
23	Q. Does this conclude your Cross-Rebuttal/Surrebuttal testimony?					
24	A. Yes, it does.					

Missouri-American Water Company

Case No. WR-2024-0320

Residential Customer Usage Per Day

Service Area	Usage Per Day
Tariff District No. 1*	204.7 gal
Tariff District No. 2**	152.4261 gal

*St. Louis County & Pevely Farm **All Other

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 and Sewer Service Provided in Missouri Service Areas

Case No. WR-2024-0320

AFFIDAVIT OF JARROD J. ROBERTSON

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS.
COUNTY OF COLE)	

COMES NOW JARROD J. ROBERTSON and on his oath declares that he is of sound mind and lawful age; that he contributed to the foregoing Cross-Rebuttal / Surrebuttal Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson; and that the same is true and correct according to his best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

JARROD J. ROBERTSON

JURAT

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my office in Jefferson City, on this day of January 2025.

D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: April 04, 2025 Commission Number: 12412070

zullankin

Notary Public