

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS ATTORNEY GENERAL
DATA REQUEST NUMBER AG 1.17

Witness Responsible:	Tyler T. Bernsen
Title:	Financial Analyst II
Phone No.:	(314) 996-2274
Date Received:	June 25, 2009
Docket No.:	09-0319

AG 1.17

Regarding the direct testimony of Tyler T. Bernsen (IAWC Ex. 7.00), at page 7, lines 158-161 and Schedule C-10,

- (a) provide the fixed and hourly rates on which the fees are based for Legal Fees and Expenses, Rate of Return Consultant, Demand Study, Cost of Service Study, and Service Company Study (see footnote 2 on Schedule C-10);
- (b) provide the actual hours worked and the hourly rate for AWWWS staff for revenue requirements (see footnote 1 on Schedule C-10);
- (c) what cost did other American Water Company operating companies incur for Cost of Service Studies in calendar years 2007, 2008, and 2009;
- (d) provide the charges that make up the Service Company Study expense;
- (e) what services were provided in connection with the \$306,102 charge for "other" on line 9; and
- (f) provide all workpapers.

RESPONSE

- (a) See attached document. See also LHW 3.04.
- (b) IAWC interprets this request to seek the actual hours charged to date developing revenue requirements for IAWC's 2009 rate case by American Water Works Service Company Inc. ("AWWSC") staff. See attached document. Note that amounts shown on line number 2 on schedule C-10 also contains projected expenses for responding to data requests. These expenses, as incurred to date, have also been included in the attached.
- (c) IAWC objects to this request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving this objection, the Company responds as follows. See attached document. Note the costs incurred for Cost of Service Studies for the American Water operating subsidiaries listed in the attached may differ from the costs for IAWC's COSS in the present case for a number of reasons, including: application of different regulatory requirements in the jurisdiction which the companies attached operate; different sizes and operational characteristics of the operating companies; different levels of complexity with respect to cost allocations and rate design and variable requirements for presentation of testimony, attendance at hearings, and response to discovery in support of a particular COSS in regulatory proceedings.
- (d) See response to (a) and attached document.
- (e) See attached document.

**ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS ATTORNEY GENERAL
DATA REQUEST NUMBER AG 1.17
PAGE 2**

(f) See above a, b, c, d, and e

[AG-1.17-R1 CONFIDENTIAL.xls](#)

Date Response Provided: September 10, 2009

PUBLIC VERSION
Confidential version on file with Chief Clerk

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
DATA REQUEST NUMBER AG 10.23

Witness Responsible:	<u>Tyler Bernsen</u>
Title:	<u>Financial Analyst II</u>
Phone No.:	<u>(314) 996-2366</u>
Date Received:	<u>November 4, 2009</u>
Docket No.:	<u>09-0319</u>

AG 10.23

Provide detailed invoices for all attorney and consultant fees and expenses that IAWC has incurred for rate case costs in the current rate case.

RESPONSE:

For attorney fees and expenses, see LHW 3.05 Update submitted on November 5, 2009.
For other consultant fees and expenses, see files attached below.

Attachment: AG 10.23 List.pdf
AG 10.23 COS Invoices.pdf
AG 10.23 CPA Invoices.pdf
AG 10.23 DEMAND Invoices.pdf
AG 10.23 ROR Invoices.pdf
AG 10.23 SERVCO STUDY Invoices.pdf

Date Response Provided: November 12, 2009

PUBLIC VERSION
Confidential version on file with Chief Clerk

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER LHW 3.03

Witness Responsible:	<u>Tyler Bernsen</u>
Title:	<u>Financial Analyst II</u>
Phone No.:	<u>(314) 996-2366</u>
Date Received:	<u>July 6, 2009</u>
Docket No.:	<u>09-0319</u>

LHW 3.03

For the Company's previous three filings for general rate increases, provide a schedule of rate case expenses in a format similar to Schedule C-10, including the docket number, date of filing and amortization periods. Indicate if any amortization periods were not the same for all service districts.

RESPONSE

Please See Attached ICC LHW 3.03-R1

Attachment:

[ICC LHW 3.03 R-1.pdf](#)

Date Response Provided: August 28, 2009

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

Rate Case Expense
Docket No. 07-0507
Filed 08/31/07

Total Company

Line No.	Outside consultant, witness, legal	Actual Case 07-0507
1	a Legal Fees and Expenses	\$ 997,904
2	b Revenue Requirement	497,278
3	c CPA Review	71,435
4	d Rate of Return Consultant	48,800
5	e Demand Study	101,556
6	f Municipal Rate Study	224,047
7	g Other	261,529
8	h Depreciation study	137,406
9	i Lead Lag Study	<u>7,208</u>
10		
11	Total	<u>\$ 2,347,164</u>
12		
13	Cost to be Amortized over 3 years (a + b + c +d + e + g)	\$ 1,978,502
14	Cost to be Amortized over 5 years (f + h+i)	<u>368,661</u>
15		
16		<u>\$ 2,347,164</u>
17		
18	Rate case expense Amortization over 3 years	
19	Amortize over 3	\$ 659,501
20	Rate case expense Amortization over 5 years	
21	Amortize over 5	<u>73,732</u>
22		
23	Total Proforma Rate Case Expense	<u>\$ 733,233</u>
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		

ICC LHW 3.03-R1

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

Rate Case Expense
Docket No. 02-0690
Filed 10/23/2002

Total Company

Line No.		Actual Case 02-0690
1	a Legal Fees and Expenses	\$ 377,480
2	b Revenue Requirement	226,021
3	c CPA Review	43,450
4	d Rate of Return Consultant	40,475
5	e Demand Study	-
6	f Municipal Rate Study	-
7	g Lead Lag Study	-
8	h Other	10,032
9	i Depreciation study	1,037
10		
11	Total	<u>\$ 698,495</u>
12		
13	Cost to be Amortized over 3 years (a + b + c + d + e + f + g + h + i)	\$ 698,495
14		-
15		
16		<u>\$ 698,495</u>
17		
18	Rate case expense Amortization over 3 years	
19	Amortize over 3 years	\$ 232,832
20	Depreciation study Amortization over 5 years	
21	Amortize over 5 years	-
22		
23	Total Rate Case Expense Amortization per year for first 3 years	<u>\$ 232,832</u>
24	Total Rate Case Expense Amortization per year for last 2 years	<u>\$ -</u>
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		

ICC LHW 3.03-R1

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY

Rate Case Expense

Docket No. 00-0340

Filed 05/10/2000

Total Company

Line No.		Actual Case 00-0340
1	a Legal Fees and Expenses	150,000
2	b Revenue Requirement	-
3	c CPA Review	53,186
4	d Rate of Return Consultant	30,966
5	e Cost of Service Study	12,638
6	f Municipal Rate Study	-
7	g Lead Lag Study	-
8	h Other	17,636
9	i Depreciation study	35,347
10		
11	Total	<u>\$ 299,774</u>
12		
13	Cost to be Amortized over 3 years (a + b + c + d + e + g + h)	\$ 251,788
14	Cost to be Amortized over 5 years (f + i)	35,347
15	Cost was Expensed in one month	<u>12,638</u>
16		
17		<u>\$ 299,774</u>
18		
19	Rate case expense Amortization over 3 years	
20	Amortize over 3 years	\$ 83,929
21	Depreciation study Amortization over 5 years	
22	Amortize over 5 years	7,069
23	Cost of Service Study	
24	Expense in 1 month	<u>12,638</u>
25		
26	Total Rate Case Expense Amortization for first year	<u>\$ 103,637</u>
27	Total Rate Case Expense Amortization per year for following 2 years	<u>\$ 90,999</u>
28	Total Rate Case Expense Amortization per year for last 2 years	<u>\$ 7,069</u>
29		
30		
31		
32		

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER LHW 4.06

Witness Responsible:	<u>Tyler Bernsen</u>
Title:	<u>Financial Analyst II</u>
Phone No.:	<u>(314) 996-2366</u>
Date Received:	<u>July 7, 2009</u>
Docket No.:	<u>09-0319</u>

LHW 4.06

Reference Schedule C-10.1, Rate Case Expense Comparisons, Line No. 5. Staff calculates the increase from the 2007 rate case to the present case for the “Demand Study” line item to be 40.81% (\$41,444/\$101,556).

- a. Reference Schedule C-10.1, Line No. 16. Please explain with specificity as to how the methodology used in the current case differed from the prior case.
- b. Reference Schedule C-10.1, Line No. 17. Please describe the “competitive bidding process” that was utilized to select the firm that prepared the Demand Study for the current case. Indicate how bids were solicited, the number of bids received, and if the firm selected was the lowest bidder. Also, please provide a copy of the winning proposal.
- c. Please provide a list of actual costs incurred in conjunction with the 2007 Demand Study.
- d. Please provide a list of actual costs invoiced to date by the firm that performed the Demand Study for the current case.

Please provide all supporting calculations and workpapers. To the extent applicable, all documents and workpapers should be provided in Excel format with working formulas.

RESPONSE

- a. The demand study in the prior case (Docket 07-0507) (“Prior Study”) was a metered customer demand study in which demand meters were installed on individual customer premises in IAWC’s Interurban Service district. As explained in Docket 07-0507, IAWC Exhibit 11.01, pp. I-2 – I-4, the customers selected for monitoring were selected as those representative of their respective classes. The customers monitored included three housing developments (low, medium and high density), commercial and public customers, industrial customers and sales for resale customers. Demand meter devices were installed on all residential, most commercial and all sales for resale customers that record water usage data every minute. Demand meter devices were installed for the remaining customers, including all the industrial customers, and one commercial customer and all the public customers that records hourly water usage data. The data thus recorded was used to develop demand factors for each of the representative customer classes.

**ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER ICC LHW 4.06
PAGE 2**

The demand study utilized in the current case (“Current Study”) is based on the principles and procedures for a demand study set forth in Appendix A of the AWWA Manual M1, titled *Principles of Water Rates, Fees, and Charges*, and was performed in accordance with the methodology detailed in IAWC Exhibit 13.02 and approved by the Commission in Docket 08-0463. As discussed by IAWC witnesses Mr. Grubb (IAWC Ex. 5.00, pp. 12-15) and Mr. McKinley (IAWC Ex. 13.00, pp. 5-6), following the entry of an Initiating Order in Docket 08-0463, the parties to Docket 08-0463 (the “Parties”), convened a workshop (“Workshop”) on September 23, 2008, to discuss the approach to the demand study. At the Workshop, IAWC presented a proposed methodology for a multi-year demand study (“Multi-Year Study”). As explained in IAWC Ex. 13.02, the Multi-Year Study reviewed historic system maximum day and maximum hour demand statistics, by treatment plant for a five to ten year period, for each IAWC rate area to determine the relationship between the maximum day and the average day for the month and determine system coincidental ratios of maximum day and hour pumpage to average day pumpage. The Multi-Year Study then reviewed billed water usage data for each customer class served by each rate area for a three to five year period, to determine the average day usage during the maximum billing period and the annual average day usage for each year by customer class. The use of historic system and billing data will allow the Multi-Year Study to identify the actual system peak demand within the time period reviewed (thus accounting for the possibility that certain years may experience higher or lower demands due to fluctuations in weather or other factors). As discussed in IAWC Ex. 13.02, this system data and billed usage data was then analyzed in conjunction with other information to determine the noncoincidental class maximum day and maximum hour demands. The analyses performed in the Multi-Year Study included a review of actual metered customer demand data from the demand study performed in the Company’s last rate case, Docket 07-0507.

The primary differences between the Prior Study and the Current Study are that the Current Study relies on historic data system and billing data for a multiple year period rather than data from customer demand meters in a single year, such as that relied on for the Prior Study. In addition, the Current Study could be completed without the need for additional customer demand meter data that could be obtained only after completion of future summer billing. Thus, the Current Study assembles information to conduct a demand study in accordance with AWWA Manual M1 without the significant cost associated with development of additional meter data during a future summer billing period.

- b. The reference to competitive bidding for the Demand Study in line 17 of Schedule C-10.1 is in error. This reference should have stated the Cost of Service Study and Service Company Study were competitively bid.

The Demand Study is a type of study which is rarely performed in the water industry and few consultants have experience and expertise performing this type of work. IAWC interviewed multiple consultants to determine their capabilities in this area and determined that Black & Veatch Corporation had the staff with this expertise and were also capable of completing the work within our required schedule. The final scope and fee for this work was then negotiated with Black & Veatch.

**ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER ICC LHW 4.06
PAGE 3**

The competitive bidding process for the Cost of Service Study and the Service Company Study began with development of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for each study which included a draft scope of services and proposed schedule for the project along with other proposal requirements. The RFPs were then forwarded to two consulting firms for the Cost of Service Study and three for the Service Company Study which IAWC knew to have experience in these areas and had previously performed work for the Company.

Proposals were received by the Company and evaluated based upon several criteria including: the consultant's proposed project approach, hourly labor cost information, the total cost of the services, the consultant's ability to meet the project schedule, and staff experience. For both of these studies, IAWC made the determination to award the work the firm which happened to have the lowest proposed cost.

Copies of the proposals from the firm awarded the Cost of Service Study and the Service Company Study are attached.

- c. See attached ICC LHW 4.06 c & d.xls.
- d. See attached ICC LHW 4.06 c & d.xls.

Attachments:

[ICC LHW 4.06 b1 - CONFIDENTIAL Illinois American - 2009 Rate Study proposal letter.pdf](#)
[ICC LHW 4.06 b2 - CONFIDENTIAL Uffleman RFP Response IAWC Cost Study 120908.pdf](#)
[ICC LHW 4.06 b3 - CONFIDENTIAL Deloitte RFP Response IAWC Cost Study 120908.pdf](#)
[ICC LHW 4.06 b4 - CONFIDENTIAL IL Gannett Fleming Ammendment\(IL\).pdf](#)
[ICC LHW 4.06 b5 - CONFIDENTIAL IL-AWC - Cost of Svc & Rate Design GF Proposal.pdf](#)
[ICC LHW 4.06 c & d CONFIDENTIAL.xls](#)

Date Response Provided: August 28, 2009

PUBLIC VERSION
Confidential version on file with Chief Clerk

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER LHW 5.01

Witness Responsible:	<u>Tyler Bernsen</u>
Title:	<u>Financial Analyst II</u>
Phone No.:	<u>(314) 996-2366</u>
Date Received:	<u>July 21, 2009</u>
Docket No.:	<u>09-0319</u>

LHW 5.01

Referring to Section 9-229 of the Public Utilities Act, which states:
(220 ILCS 5/9-229 new) Sec. 9-229. Consideration of attorney and expert compensation as an expense. The Commission shall specifically assess the justness and reasonableness of any amount expended by a public utility to compensate attorneys or technical experts to prepare and litigate a general rate case filing. This issue shall be expressly addressed in the Commission's final order.

Please answer the following:

- a) Does IAWC contend that each amount set forth in Schedule C-10 is a just and reasonable expense? If so, provide all facts, information, data, analyses and assessments supporting the contention that the amounts set forth in Schedule C-10 are just and reasonable amounts to prepare and litigate the current general rate case;
- b) For the items set forth in the Company's Schedule C-10, provide the amount actually incurred for each item as of June 30, 2009 and, to the extent not otherwise provided in response to part a) of this data request, provide a specific assessment of why the Commission should find that each of the amounts actually incurred is a just and reasonable amount to prepare and litigate the current general rate case. This response should be updated to reflect additional rate case expense actually incurred each subsequent month as documentation such as invoices becomes available;
- c) To the extent that any overtime to compensate any attorney or technical expert employed or retained by IAWC to prepare and litigate this general rate case is included in the test year revenue requirement proposed by the Company, identify the amounts so included and, to the extent not otherwise provided in response to parts a) and b) of this data request, provide a specific assessment of why the Commission should find that each of the amounts is a just and reasonable amount to prepare and litigate the current general rate case; and
- d) To the extent that IAWC has actually incurred expenses including overtime to compensate any attorney or technical expert employed or retained by the Company to prepare and litigate this general rate case, provide the amount of overtime expenses actually incurred to date and provide a specific assessment of why the Commission should find that the amount of overtime expense actually incurred is a just and reasonable amount to prepare and litigate the current general rate case.

Provide all supporting calculations and workpapers. To the extent applicable, all documents and workpapers should be provided in Excel format with working formulas.

**ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER ICC LHW 5.01
PAGE 2**

RESPONSE

IAWC objects to this request as calling for a legal conclusion. IAWC further objects to this request as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Subject to and without waiving these objections IAWC responds as follows.

- a) Each of the amounts shown on Schedule C-10 is a just and reasonable expense. The following addresses each of the expense components of Rate Case Expense as shown on Schedule C-10 (First Revised):

Legal Fees and Expenses

The amount of Legal Fees and Expenses is reasonable because it is based on a projection of legal fees and expense for this rate case by the Company's legal service providers that reflects those providers' past experience representing Illinois water utilities in rate proceedings, including IAWC's prior rate case, Docket 07-0507. Mr. Springer has 30 years of experience representing Illinois public utilities before the Commission and Jones Day has represented Illinois water utilities in numerous Commission rate proceedings. The legal fees and expense amount is based on hourly rates for Jones Day attorneys and Mr. Springer (as shown on AG 1.17-R1) that are consistent with or below the market rates for law partners and associates in the Midwest region (particularly Chicago and St. Louis) as shown on IAWC Exhibit 11.01 (Service Company Cost Study), Schedules 4, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. The amount shown on Schedule C-10 (First Revised) also represents a lower amount of legal fees and expenses than the amount actually incurred in Docket 07-0507, as shown on Schedule C-10.1. In addition, as set forth in LHW 3.04 and AG 1.17, the legal fees of Jones Day and Mr. Springer include a "not-to-exceed" amount, which is intended in part to ensure that the projection of legal expense is reliable and that the amounts actually incurred for legal expense are consistent with the projection. As shown on the attachment to LHW 3.04(c), over 43% of the projected legal fees and expenses amount has already been incurred, despite the fact that significant work (review of testimony, hearing and briefing) remains to be done in the case.

Revenue Requirement

The Company notes that it does not consider the costs under "Revenue Requirement" on Schedule C-10 to be "attorney and expert compensation" as set forth in Section 9-229 of the Public Utilities Act. The costs under "Revenue Requirement" represent the cost of IAWC, Service Company, and temporary personnel to prepare the rate case filing. The costs estimated for Revenue Requirement include the preparation of the revenue requirement and all testimonies, preparation of responses to data requests, participation in hearings, providing analyses during the case, and preparation of final tariffs. The amount for Revenue Requirement was determined by estimating the number of hours expected to be expended by Company personnel and multiplying the hours by the respective employee rate including overheads. The Revenue Requirement estimate represents a 34% decrease from the amount included in the prior rate case.

**ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER ICC LHW 5.01
PAGE 3**

CPA Review

The amount for CPA Review is reasonable because it is set as a flat fee. The flat fee level is nearly 32% less than the actual cost incurred for CPA Review in the prior case, as shown on Schedule C-10.1. The firm retained to perform the CPA Review and audit of IAWC's forecast has performed the audit for IAWC's prior rate case and has experience working with IAWC personnel and Illinois regulatory matters.

Rate of Return Consultant

The amount for rate of return consultant is reasonable because it is consistent with the actual expense incurred for the rate of return consultant in the prior case, Docket 07-0507, as shown in Schedule C-10.1. The rate of return consultant, Ms. Ahern, has significant experience performing rate of return analyses for regulated utilities. In addition, the amount for the rate of return consultant is based on hourly rates (set forth in AG 1.17-R1) that are consistent with the market rates for accounting services as shown on IAWC Exhibit 11.01 (Service Company Cost Study), Schedule 1 and are substantially lower than the market rates for cost of equity consultants shown on IAWC Exhibit 11.01, Schedule 5.2.

Demand Study

Preparation of a demand study was required by the Commission in its Order in Docket 07-0507. The increase reflects the differences between the two studies as described in LHW 4.06. See also response to PL 3.01. The difference in scope between the prior demand study in 07-0507 and the current case results from the fact that the demand study in the present case is the product of a methodology that was, as discussed by Mr. Grubb (IAWC Exhibit 5.00, pp. 12-15), developed in coordination with the parties in Docket 08-0463 and approved by the Commission in that Docket. The approved demand study methodology was intended, in part, to address concerns raised in docket 07-0507 about the demand study utilized in that case. As indicated in the response to those concerns, the demand study consultant was selected due to his expertise and prior experience in the preparation of water demand studies. In addition, the amount for the demand study is based in part on an hourly rate (set forth in AG 1.17-R1) that is consistent with the market rate for consultants as shown on IAWC Exhibit 11.01 (Service Company Cost Study), Schedule 5.

Cost of Service Study

Preparation of the cost of service study ("COSS") was required by the Commission in its Order in Docket 07-0507. The amount for the cost of service study is reasonable because the COSS consultant was selected as a result of a competitive bid (see LHW 4.06). The COSS consultant's bid was the low bid. In addition, the COSS consultant, Mr. Herbert, has substantial experience performing COSS for regulated utilities. The amount for the cost of service study is based on hourly rates for a principal and associate (set forth in AG 1.17-R1) that are consistent with the market rates for similar positions in the management consulting services area shown in Exhibit 11.01 (Service Company Cost Study), Schedules 5 and 5.2.

**ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER ICC LHW 5.01
PAGE 4**

Other

The Company notes that it does not consider the costs under “Other” on Schedule C-10 to be “attorney and expert compensation” as set forth in Section 9-229 of the Public Utilities Act. Other rate case expense includes amounts estimated for mailing to customers rate case-related information and legal notices as required under the Public Utilities Act and Commission rules, postage, and additional communications needs during the course of the rate case including estimated costs to be incurred for public meetings. The amount of Other rate case expense represents a 17% increase from the actual amount of this expense incurred in Docket 07-0507. The 17% increase is reasonable because it reflects a postal rate increase that took effect subsequent to the last rate case and includes a projected level of costs related to additional public forums, over and above the one public forum that was held in Champaign in the last rate case.

Service Company Study

The Commission’s Final Order in Docket 07-0507, Section IV.B.6.d, required IAWC to “...conduct a study comparing the cost of each service obtained from the Service Company to the costs of such services had they been obtained through competitive bidding on the open market. As part of the study, IAWC must also provide an analysis of the services provided by the Service Company to all of IAWC’s affiliates. The analysis must provide details on the specific services provided to IAWC and how costs are allocated among affiliates of IAWC. IAWC shall include the study in its next rate filing.” As Mr. Uffelman explains (IAWC Ex. 10.00, p. 4-5) the Service Fee Study is part of the testimony and exhibits presented by IAWC in response to the requirements of the Commission’s Order in Docket 07-0507. The amount on Schedule C-10 for the service company study is reasonable because the service company study consultant was selected as a result of a competitive bid (see LHW 4.06). The service company study consultant’s bid was the low bid. In addition, Mr. Uffelman, one of the service company study consultants, has extensive experience working in the Illinois regulatory field (and worked for the Commission at one time), and had recently worked on IAWC’s Municipal Rate Study in Docket 07-0507. The service company study consultant was also selected due to the fact that the service company study consultant had superior expertise and experience related to the scope of the service company study and the service company study consultant (both Deloitte & Touche and Mr. Uffelman) had the necessary resources to perform the service company study in the Company’s time frame. In addition, as set forth in LHW 3.04 and AG 1.17, the cost to prepare the service company study and direct testimony included a “not-to-exceed” amount, which is intended in part to ensure that the projection of the expense is reliable and that the amounts actually incurred for the service company study are consistent with the projection.

- b) The amounts actually incurred to date for Legal Fees and Expenses rate case expense were provided in response to LHW 3.04. The amounts actually incurred to date for the other items in Schedule C-10 are shown on the attached. An assessment of the reasonableness of the cost for each item is provided in (a).
- c) No overtime compensation was provided to any attorney or technical expert employed or retained by IAWC to prepare and litigate this general rate case.

**ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER ICC LHW 5.01
PAGE 5**

d) See (c).

Attached: [ICC LHW 5.01 \(b\) rate case expense.xls](#)

Date Response Provided: September 2, 2009

Illinois-American Water Company
ICC LHW 5.01 (b)
Rate Case expense as of June 30, 2009

	Rate Case Expense incurred As of June 30, 2009	
Legal Fees and Expenses	\$	330,760
Revenue Requirement		267,628
CPA Review		41,283
Rate of Return Consultant		12,800
Demand Study		34,953
Cost of Service Study		38,324
Other		84,142
Service Company Study		348,871
Total	\$	1,158,760

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER LHW 7.01

Witness Responsible:	Tyler Bernsen
Title:	Financial Analyst II
Phone No.:	(314) 996-2274
Date Received:	September 3, 2009
Docket No.:	09-0319

LHW 7.01

This request is a follow up to the Company's response to Staff data request LHW 5.01 b). On the attached Excel spreadsheet, Rate Case Expense, please provide the amount of expense actually incurred for each item as of August 31, 2009, by completing Column D, Lines 1 through 9. Also, if there are reasons to adjust the original estimates from Schedule C-10 (for example, the final cost of the Demand Study is known and measureable), please complete Column E, lines 1 through 9.

RESPONSE

See Attached.

Attachment:
ICC LHW 7 01-R1.xls

Date Response Provided: September 17, 2009

ICC LHW 7.01-R1

Illinois-American Water Company
Rate Case Expense
LHW 7.01

Line No.	(A)	Rate Case Expense	From LHW 5.01 b)	Rate Case Expense incurred	Rate Case Expense incurred	Rate Case Expense
		Estimated - From Schedule C-10	Rate Case Expense incurred	As of June 30, 2009	As of August 31, 2009	Revised Estimate
		(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	
1	Legal Fees and Expenses	\$930,000		\$330,760		\$516,430
2	Revenue Requirement	329,494		267,628		340,752
3	CPA Review	48,700		41,283		41,283
4	Rate of Return Consultant	52,760		12,800		13,275
5	Demand Study (1)	143,000		34,953		144,283
6	Cost of Service Study	106,540		38,324		57,689
7	Other	306,102		84,142		104,288
8	Service Company Study	422,900		348,871		348,871
9	Total	\$2,339,496		\$1,158,760		\$1,566,871

(1) Note: Demand Study amount in Column (D) reflects costs previously incurred by the Company, but inadvertently recorded to the incorrect account. The amount not included in 5.01 b) for Demand Study expense as of June 30 was \$97,050. The total as of June 30 was actually \$132,003.

ILLINOIS-AMERICAN WATER COMPANY
RESPONSE TO ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
DATA REQUEST NUMBER LHW 10.03

Witness Responsible:	<u>Tyler Bernsen</u>
Title:	<u>Financial Analyst II</u>
Phone No.:	<u>(314) 996-2274</u>
Date Received:	<u>October 2, 2009</u>
Docket No.:	<u>09-0319</u>

LHW 10.03

This request is a follow up to the Company's response to Staff data request LHW 5.01 b) and LHW 7.01. On the attached Excel spreadsheet, Rate Case Expense, please provide the amount of expense actually incurred for each item as of September 30, 2009, by completing Column E, Lines 1 through 9. Also, if there are reasons to adjust the original estimates from Schedule C-10 (for example, the final cost of the Demand Study is known and measureable), please complete Column F, lines 1 through 9.

RESPONSE

See attached.

Attachment:

[ICC LHW 10 03-R1.xls](#)

Date Response Provided: October 19, 2009

ICC LHW 10.03-R1

Illinois-American Water Company
Rate Case Expense

Line No.	(A)	Rate Case Expense	From LHW 5.01 b)	From LHW 7.01	Rate Case Expense incurred	Rate Case Expense incurred	Rate Case Expense incurred
		Estimated - From Schedule C-10	Rate Case Expense incurred				
	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)			
1	Legal Fees and Expenses	\$930,000	\$330,760	\$516,430	\$535,402	\$481,646	
2	Revenue Requirement	329,494	267,628	340,752	380,596	420,014	
3	CPA Review	48,700	41,283	41,283	41,283	41,283	
4	Rate of Return Consultant	52,760	12,800	13,275	14,253	14,253	
5	Demand Study	143,000	34,953	144,283	157,743	157,743	
6	Cost of Service Study	106,540	38,324	57,689	57,689	64,272	
7	Other	306,102	84,142	104,288	143,812	144,497	
8	Service Company Study	422,900	348,871	348,871	357,371	478,046	
9	Total	\$2,339,496	\$1,158,760	\$1,566,871	\$1,688,148	\$1,801,753	\$0