BASS, BERRY & SIMS PLC

A PROFESSIONAL LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ROSS BOOHER TEL: (615) 742-7764 FAX: (615) 742-2744 rbooher@bassberry.com

AMSOUTH CENTER
315 DEADERICK STREET, SUITE 2700
NASHVILLE, TN 37238-3001
(615) 742-6200
2003 FMY S PM 12 22

KNOXVILLE MEMPHIS

OTHER OFFICES

MayP5G96680TY AUTHOR...Y

VIA HAND-DELIVERY

Chairman Eddie Roberson, PhD c/o Ms. Sharla Dillon Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37243

Re: Petition Of Tennessee American Water Company To Change And Increase Certain Rates And Charges So As To Permit It To Earn A Fair And Adequate Rate Of Return On Its Property Used And Useful In Furnishing Water Service To Its Customers Docket No. 08-00039

Dear Chairman Roberson:

Enclosed please find an original and sixteen (16) sets of copies of Tennessee American Water Company's Response to Intervenors' Request for Unlimited Discovery.

Please return three copies of each of this Response, which I would appreciate your stamping as "filed," and returning to me by way of our courier.

Should you have any questions concerning any of the enclosed, please do not hesitate to contact me.

With kindest regards, I remain

Very truly yours,

Ross Booher

RB/smb Enclosures Chairman Eddie Roberson, PhD May 9, 2008 Page 2

cc: Hon. Ron Jones (w/o enclosure)

Hon. Sara Kyle (w/o enclosure)

Hon. Tre Hargett (w/o enclosure)

Ms. Darlene Standley, Chief of Utilities Division (w/o enclosure)

Richard Collier, Esq. (w/o enclosure)

Mr. Jerry Kettles, Chief of Economic Analysis & Policy Division (w/o enclosure)

Ms. Pat Murphy (*w/o enclosure*)

Timothy C. Phillips, Esq. (w/enclosure)

David C. Higney, Esq. (w/enclosure)

Henry M. Walker, Esq. (w/enclosure)

Michael A. McMahan, Esq. (w/enclosure)

Frederick L. Hitchcock, Esq., (w/enclosure)

Mr. John Watson (w/o enclosure)

Mr. Michael A. Miller (w/o enclosure)

6814099.1

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

IN RE:

PETITION OF TENNESSEE AMERICAN)
WATER COMPANY TO CHANGE AND)
INCREASE CERTAIN RATES AND CHARGES)
SO AS TO PERMIT IT TO EARN A FAIR AND)
ADEQUATE RATE OF RETURN ON ITS) Docket No. 08-00039
PROPERTY USED AND USEFUL IN)
FURNISHING WATER SERVICE TO ITS)
CUSTOMERS)

TENNESSEE AMERICAN WATER COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO INTERVENORS' REQUEST FOR UNLIMITED DISCOVERY

Tennessee American Water Company (the "Company") hereby responds to Intervenors' Joint Objection to the Hearing Officer's Procedural and Scheduling Order, which requests unlimited discovery in this matter, as follows:

- 1. The Intervenors in this Docket have not demonstrated any need for the unlimited discovery they request. The TRA Rules provide a limit of 40 discovery requests per party. TRA Rule 1220-1-2-.11(5)(a). The Hearing Officer in this docket has already generously granted the Consumer Advocate twice the standard number of requests allotted by the TRA Rules after considering the Petition, the Company's filings, the TRA staff's comprehensive data requests, and understanding the likely issues in this case. The Intervenors should not be permitted to unnecessarily complicate this case by replacing the Hearing Officer's ample limitation with limitless discovery.
- 2. Discovery limitations are essential for helping the parties focus their efforts to avoid inefficiency. Accordingly, the burden to justify additional discovery is justly placed on the party claiming it cannot make its case under the standard discovery limitations. To meet this

burden, the TRA Rules expressly require the proponent of extraordinary discovery to present its proposed discovery along with its motion for leave to serve that discovery. *See* TRA Rule 1220-1-2-.11(5)(a). This enables the Authority to weigh the justification for every single additional request sought. The Intervenors have not even attempted to comply with this explicit requirement.

3. There are multiple Intervenors, each of which will likely serve its own discovery requests. Pursuant to the Order Granting Petitions to Intervene and Establishing a Procedural Schedule, the Consumer Advocate is permitted to serve 80 discovery requests in the first round, along with 40 each from the Chattanooga Manufacturers' Association and the City of Chattanooga. It would be unduly burdensome for the Company to have to respond to more than 160 discovery requests in the first round of discovery. The Intervenors should be able to collaborate in such a way as to make effective use of this extraordinary number of discovery requests.¹

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, the Intervenors' Joint Objection seeking unlimited discovery should be overruled, and the discovery limitation imposed in the Hearing Officer's Order Granting Petitions to Intervene and Establishing a Procedural Schedule should remain in effect.

_

The Intervenors point out that, in TRA Docket No. 07-00105, the Consumer Advocate "propounded 243 discovery requests, including subparts, prior to filing its direct testimony." (See Joint Objection, ¶3). It should be noted that, in Docket No. 07-00105, the Consumer Advocate justified its request to propound extra discovery by asserting that the petitioner (Atmos Energy Corporation) was proposing "new and potentially controversial" theories of ratemaking. (See Consumer Advocate's Memorandum in Support of Leave to Serve Additional Discovery Requests, Docket No. 07-00105). The Consumer Advocate has not made any similar argument here. Additionally, Atmos Energy agreed to much of the Consumer Advocate's proposed expanded discovery. (See Order Granting Petitions to Intervene, Permitting Additional Discovery Requests, Establishing a Procedural Schedule and Suspending Tariffs, Docket No. 07-00105, entered May 31, 2007). The Company does not agree to the limitless discovery requested by the Intervenors in this docket. Accordingly, the number of discovery requests allowed in Docket No. 07-00105 is irrelevant to this docket, and provides the Hearing Officer with no reason to amend his earlier decision to generously grant the Consumer Advocate double the number of discovery requests provided in the TRA Rules.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Dale Grimes (#6223) Ross I. Booher (#019304) BASS, BERRY & SIMS PLC 315 Deaderick Street, Suite 2700 Nashville, TN 37238-3001 (615) 742-6200

Counsel for Petitioner Tennessee American Water Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served via the method(s) indicated, on this the 4 th day of May, 2008, upon the following:

[x] Hand-Delivery[] U.S. Mail[] Facsimile[] Overnight[x] Email	Timothy C. Phillips, Esq. Consumer Advocate and Protection Division Office of Attorney General 2nd Floor 425 5th Avenue North Nashville, TN 37243-0491
[] Hand-Delivery[] U.S. Mail[] Facsimile[x] Overnight[x] Email	David C. Higney, Esq. Counsel for Chattanooga Manufacturers Association Grant, Konvalinka & Harrison, P.C. 633 Chestnut Street, 9th Floor Chattanooga, TN 37450
[x] Hand-Delivery[] U.S. Mail[] Facsimile[] Overnight[x] Email	Henry M. Walker, Esq. Counsel for Chattanooga Manufacturers Association Boult, Cummings, Conners & Berry, PLC Suite 700 1600 Division Street Nashville, TN 37203
[] Hand-Delivery[] U.S. Mail[] Facsimile[x] Overnight[x] Email	Michael A. McMahan, Esq. Special Counsel City of Chattanooga (Hamilton County) Office of the City Attorney Suite 400 801 Broad Street Chattanooga, TN 37402
[] Hand-Delivery[] U.S. Mail[] Facsimile[x] Overnight[x] Email	Frederick L. Hitchcock, Esq. Harold L. North, Jr., Esq. Counsel for City of Chattanooga Chambliss, Bahner & Stophel, P.C. 1000 Tallan Building Two Union Square Chattanooga, TN 37402

6811183.3