BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 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

REPLY BRIEF

)

COMES NOW the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Staff"), by and through counsel, and files its Reply Brief:

Rate Design

In its Initial Brief, the Missouri Energy Consumers Group ("MECG") addresses a number of concerns with Staff's position on rate design. This Reply Brief will address two of those concerns.

1. The Commission relies on its technical Staff.

MECG accurately states that ..."the Commission relies on its technical staff to audit, evaluate, and provide substantive assessment on the costs that utilities incur to provide service."¹ Because Commission Staff has additional resources compared to some parities in large rate cases, MECG concludes that Staff's lack of a new CCOS study in this rate case is unreasonable. Without completely restating the argument, Staff still finds its approach to rate design in this case to be just and reasonable. While Staff will continue to attempt to develop a new CCOS for most large cases, a lack of a new CCOS every two years does not inherently mean that Staff's position is unreasonable. Settlements that do not rely on a Staff CCOS are routinely presented to the Commission. This does not

¹ MECG Initial Brief, p. 7.

make the Commission's decision to approve such a settlement inherently flawed. Additionally, the work that Commission Staff puts into a large rate case cannot be measured or assessed by the approach taken to address a single issue. While MECG may not agree with Staff's approach to this issue, extensive work went into this case by Staff: from pre-filed testimony to technical and settlement conferences to hearing preparations, Staff worked diligently to provide its recommendations on all issues to the Commission.

2. Staff's position relies on a flawed CCOS study.

MECG claims that Staff's CCOS study in Case No. WR-2022-0303 was "deeply flawed" and unreliable."² However, when questioned during the evidentiary hearing, MECG witness Jessica York, confirmed that Staff had made corrections to its CCOS study in Case No. WR-2022-0303, but that she was "not able to verify whether those were acceptable or...justified, reasonable, correct..."³ MECG's issues with the CCOS study to which Staff is recommending an equal percent increase be applied, stem more from MECG's disagreement with Staff's position than from actual errors. Parties frequently correct and update their positions as a case progresses and mistakes and changes are discovered that need to be remedied. In addition, CCOS studies presented by various parties to a case often have significantly different results based upon the methodology and goals of the parties. If using a different methodology than MECG makes all other CCOS "deeply flawed" and "unreliable", it would mean that the Commission should forgo

² MECG Initial Brief, p. 8.

³ Transcript Vol. 10, p. 177, l. 16-22.

consideration of a CCOS study presented by utilities, Staff, or any other party. This is not a reasonable position.

For the reason stated above, and in its *Initial Brief*, Staff continues to support the position that an equal percent increase to rates across classes will result in just and reasonable rates for MAWC customers.

WHEREFORE, Staff submits this Reply Brief for the Commission's consideration and information.

Respectfully Submitted,

<u>/s/ Casi Aslin</u>

Casi Aslin Deputy Counsel Missouri Bar No. 67934 P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, Mo 65102 (573) 751-8517 casi.aslin@psc.mo.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been mailed, hand delivered, transmitted by facsimile or electronically mailed to all counsel of record this 18th day of April, 2025.

<u>/s/ Casi Aslin</u>