COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	The same of				-
In	the	M	lat	ter	Of:

ROGER W. PARRY)	
COMPLAINANT)	CASE NO. 2017-00452
V.)	2017 00402
KENTUCKY-AMERICAN WATER)	
DEFENDANT)	

ORDER

Kentucky-American Water ("Kentucky-American") is hereby notified that it has been named as defendant in a formal complaint ("Complaint") filed on November 30, 2017, a copy of which is attached hereto. The Complaint, filed by Roger W. Parry, alleges that Kentucky-American failed to comply with its obligations under its tariff. He states that his March/April 2017 bill was higher than normal, but that he was led to believe that there was no problem when the bill returned to a normal amount for the April/May 2017 and May/June 2017 billing periods.

When he received his bill for the June/July 2017 period, Mr. Parry states it had increased by 13,000 percent over the same time period in 2016. Mr. Parry states that Kentucky-American did notify him on July 12, 2017, of the increase in his water bill, as it is required to do under Kentucky-American's tariff, Rule 20(K)(3). However, there is no indication that Kentucky-American performed a second meter reading, as required by Rule 20(K)(2) of Kentucky-American's tariff.

Mr. Parry next requested that Kentucky-American test his meter. The testing was performed and no defect was found. His water line was tested for leaks and no leaks were found. Kentucky-American replaced his meter at his request and his bills returned to their normal amount. Mr. Parry alleges that there must have been a problem with the prior meter and that there was a delay in locating the problem because his bills for April/May 2017 and May/June 2017 were based on estimates and not a reading of his meter. Mr. Parry asks for relief from the June/July 2017 bill, in the amount of \$659.94, and for relief of \$420.54 from July 2017 bill, less the amounts he has already paid toward those bills.

Based on a review of the Complaint and being otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that there is insufficient information to determine whether Mr. Parry has presented a *prima facie* case. The Complaint alleges that two bills were based on estimates, but does not provide any evidence that they were. Similarly, the Complaint alleges that the meter was tested and was not defective, but that after the meter was replaced, the billing amounts returned to normal. However, due to the issues raised in the Complaint, the Commission finds that, in order to assist the Commission in determining whether the Complaint should move forward, Kentucky-American should file a detailed response to the Complaint, including evidence regarding whether the April/May 2017 and May/June 2017 bills were based on estimates and the results of the meter testing performed on Mr. Parry's water meter. Upon Kentucky-American filing of their response, the Commission will determine its next action.

Based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Within ten days of the date of entry of this Order, Kentucky-American shall file a response to the Complaint of Roger W. Parry.

2. A party filing a paper containing personal information shall, in accordance

with 807 KAR 5:001, Section 4(10), encrypt or redact the paper so that personal

information cannot be read.

3. Documents of any kind filed with the Commission in the course of this

proceeding shall also be served on all parties of record.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

By the Commission

ENTERED

MAR 1 4 2018

KENTUCKY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ATTEST:

Executive Director

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

RECEIVED

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

NOV 2 9 2017

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ROGER W. PARRY	
(Your Full Name)) COMPLAINANT)	
VS.)	Case No. 2017-00452
(Name of Utility) DEFENDANT)	
COMPLAINT	
The complaint of ROGER W. PARRY (Your Full Name)	respectfully shows:
(a) ROGER W. PARRY (Your Full Name)	
3415 WOODSIDE WAY LEXING	670N, KY 40502-3344
(b) KENTUCKY AMERICAN WATER (Name of Utility)	
2300 RICHMOND RD., LEXING (Address of Utility)	TON, KY 40502
(c) That: PLEASE SEE ATTAC	
(Describe here, attaching additional	al sheets if necessary,
the specific act, fully and clearly, o	r facts that are the reason
and basis for the complaint.)	-

Continued on Next Page



In the matter of:

Attachment under section (c) of Complaint dated November 27, 2017

(c) That:

This complaint concerns my June – July 2017 and July – August 2017 bills from the Kentucky American Water company.

I received my June-July 2017 water bill on July 15, 2017; the amount was \$659.94. On Monday, July 17, 2017, I visited the Kentucky American water office to inquire about the high billing amount. A technician came to inspect my water meter during the week of July 24, 2017 and confirmed that the meter was operating normally and could not explain why the bill was so high (a 13,100% increase over my bill from June 2016). At my request, Kentucky American Water replaced my meter (number 90739475) on July 25, 2017. A subsequent inspection of my water lines on August 9, 2017 by Right On Leak and Line Inspection (phone 859-619-5589, ticket #1827) confirmed that there were no leaks on my water system.

My complaint is that I believe that Kentucky American Water failed to comply with its obligations under Kentucky Public Service Commission Number 6, Rule 20, Monitoring of Customer Usage (C) 1 through (C) 4. While Kentucky American Water did notify me on July 12, 2017 of the increase in my water bill, as required under (C) 3, there was no indication that the meter was reread before my account was billed, as required under (C) 2. As such, I am questioning the meter reading process itself.

A review of my water bills since October 2015 indicates a number of nearly identical readings with occasional spikes prior to the major spikes between June – August 2017. Specifically, between December 2016 and April 2017 my water bill reflected a 250% increase – increasing to 5 units in April 2017 – after three consecutive months of 2 units of usage. I paid these bills, but then noted that my April 2017 and May 2017 bills dropped inexplicably to 1 unit each. When the June 2017 bill indicated my usage had increased from 1 unit to 132 units, I immediately contacted the water company.

I have seen no evidence that my meter was actually read, and not just estimated, in April and May 2017. I find it difficult to understand how my usage of 1 unit was identical during April and May 2017, following an inexplicable spike between February and March 2017 (from 2 units to 5 units). The below table summarizes the issue:

ROGER W. PARRY NOVEMBER 27, 2017

Billing Period Start	Billing Period End	Billed Consumption (Units)	
Dec. 2, 2016	Jan. 3, 2017	2	
Jan. 4, 2017	Feb. 1, 2017	2	
Feb. 2, 2017	March 1, 2017	2	
March 2, 2017	April 3, 2017	5	
April 4, 2017	May 1, 2017	1	
May 2, 2017	June 1, 2017	1	
June 2, 2017	July 3, 2017	132	
July 4, 2017	Aug. 1, 2017	83	

If a problem with the meter had begun to occur in March 2017 and continued until I became aware of its severity in July 2017 (June 2017 bill), a pattern would have been apparent on the April 2017 bill and could have been investigated before it became so severe. In fact, the drop from 5 units to 1 unit on the April 2017 and May 2017 bills led me to believe that there was no problem. Given that I was charged 1 unit each for these two months – which is the same that I was charged for these months in 2016 – I am led to believe that the April 2017 and May 2017 bills were based on estimates rather than actual readings.

To illustrate the significance of these bills, if my June 2017 bill was correct, I would have had to have consumed an average of 3,085 gallons per day (128 gallons per hour) for the entire billing period. Similarly, if my July 2017 bill was correct, I would have had to have consumed an average of 2,956 gallons per day (123 gallons per hour) for the entire billing period.

As I live alone, do not have an in-ground sprinkler system or swimming pool, and have confirmed that I did not have leaks during these billing periods, I cannot agree to pay the amounts billed. However, I have continued to make monthly payments on all bills received, all of which have been in excess of the normally expected billing (based on historical amounts billed).

ROLER W. PARRY NOVEMBER 27, 2017

ROGER W. PARRY	VS.	KENTUCKY	AMERICAN	Wi
2 of 2				
2012				
			IX	
		2		
	·			
<u> </u>				
Wherefore, complainant asks				- 10
	(Specif	fically state the r	elief desired.)	
		-		
			-	
Dated at LEXINGTON		, Kentucky,	this 27	da
(Your City)				

^tComplaints by corporations or associations, or any other organization having the right to file a complaint, must be signed by its attorney and show his post office address. No oral or unsigned complaints will be entertained or acted upon by the Commission.



(Name and address of attorney, if any)

(Your Signature*)

Date

Attachment under section (c) of Complaint dated November 27, 2017

Wherefore, complainant asks that the following proposed relief be accepted:

Billing amounts for the periods of June 2, 2017 through July 3, 2017 (\$659.94), and July 4-24, 2017 (\$420.54) be waived, and below payments be accepted:

Billing Period (2017)			Billing Date	Amount Billed	Amount Paid
June 2	through	July 3	July 11	659.94	\$50.00
July 4	through	August 1	August 2	\$420.54	\$25.00
August 2	through	September 1	September 6	\$16.51	\$16.51
September 2	through	October 2	October 3	\$17.18	\$17.18
October 3	through	November 1	November 2	\$17.37	\$17.27

ROGERW, PARNY NOVEMBER 27,2017 Roger Parry 3415 Woodside Way Lexington, KENTUCKY 40502

*Kentucky-American Water Company 2300 Richmond Road Lexington, KY 40502

*Linda C Bridwell Director Engineering Kentucky-American Water Company 2300 Richmond Road Lexington, KY 40502