Exhibit No.: Issue: Off-System Sales Margins Witness: V. William Harris Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony Case No: ER-2009-0090 Date Testimony Prepared: March 13, 2009

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

V. WILLIAM HARRIS, CPA, CIA

Great Plains Energy, Incorporated GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY GMO-MPS AND GMO-L&P ELECTRIC

CASE NO. ER-2009-0090

Jefferson City, Missouri March 2009

1	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY						
2	OF						
3	V. WILLIAM HARRIS, CPA, CIA						
4 5 6 7 8	Great Plains Energy, Inc. GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY GMO-MPS AND GMO-L&P ELECTRIC CASE NO. ER-2009-0090						
9	Q. Please state your name and business address.						
10	A. V. William Harris, Fletcher Daniels State Office Building, Room G8						
11	615 East 13 th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.						
12	Q. Are you the same V. William Harris that filed testimony in the						
13	Staff's Cost of Service Report dated February 13, 2009?						
14	A. Yes. I also filed direct testimony on February 11, 2009 and rebuttal testimony						
15	on March 11, 2009 in the Kansas City Power & Light Company rate case, Case No.						
16	ER-2009-0089 regarding fuel, purchased power costs and, on the subject of this rebuttal						
17	testimony, off-system sales.						
18	Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?						
19	A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to address the direct testimony o						
20	KCPL Greater Missouri Operations Company (GMO or Company) witness Tim M. Rush on						
21	the issue of off-system sales margins.						
22	Q. Are off-system sales an issue in this case?						
23	A. There is a significant difference between the Company and Staff relating to the						
24	treatment of GMO MPS and GMO L&P off-system sales margin in this case. However, Staff						
25	recently learned in discussion with Mr. Rush on Thursday, March 12, 2009 that GMO does						
26	not consider off-system sales to be an issue if off-system sales margins are included						

Rebuttal Testimony of V. William Harris

Q.

in a MPS and L&P fuel adjustment clause (FAC) in this case. Mr. Rush stated that if those
off-system sales are included in the FAC, that would resolve the differences and if an
FAC is not agreed to then GMO would address differences in its surrebuttal filing.
Staff informed GMO that since no agreement on an FAC is currently in place that Staff would
be filing rebuttal on this issue.

6

What are off-system sales margins?

A. Off-system sales (OSS) are sales of electricity made at times when utilities
have met all obligations to serve their native load customers and have excess energy to sell to
other utilities at non-regulated prices higher than the cost to serve their native load customers.
Margins (profits) are the gross revenues from each sale less the fuel and purchased power
expenses GMO incurs in that sale.

12 Q. What is GMO's position on the level of OSS margins to include in the revenue13 requirement in this proceeding?

A. On page 6, lines 13 and 14, of his direct testimony, GMO witness
Tim M. Rush states, "An adjustment was made to exclude risk based sales from the
anticipated off-system sales margin included in this filing."

17 Q. How did GMO define and determine the amount of "risk based sales"18 to exclude from its OSS margin in this filing?

In response to Staff Data Request No. 184, GMO defines "risk based trades" 19 A. 20 as trades sourced from non-network resources but goes on to state "Sales from risk based 21 trading are not separated in the financial records/internal reports from other off-system sales 22 transactions." In response to Data Request No. 329, GMO states, "KCPL-GMO 23 (formerly Aquila-Networks) is unable to break apart Risk Based Trades 24 (this includes Q-Sales, Bilateral for Bilateral Sales) from Non-Risk Based Trades with the

Rebuttal Testimony of V. William Harris

1	exception of Virtual Transactions." (Per GMO, virtual transactions use unique contracts not							
2	used for other transactions.) In meetings with Staff, GMO has indicated that a level of 75% is							
3	the percentage of OSS margins that were risk based sales/trades but has not revealed any							
4	specific manner or methodology for determining that amount.							
5	Q.	Does Staff	believe it	is pro	oper rater	making treatment to exclude		
6	these OSS margins in the determination of the revenue requirement in this proceeding?							
7	A. No. It is inappropriate ratemaking treatment to exclude these OSS margins in							
8	this proceeding because Missouri retail electric customers are paying for all costs associated							
9	with the facilities needed to attain these OSS margins							
10	Q.	Q. Do GMO's historical off-system sales margins appear "risky"?						
11	А.	No. GMO's total MPS and L&P actual off-system sales margins from 2000						
12	through 2008	rough 2008 are reflected below:						
13		<u>Year</u>	Actual Dol	llars	Margir	<u>1 %</u>		
14		2000	**	**	**	**		
15		2001	**	**	**	**		
16		2002	**	**	**	**		
17		2003	**	**	**	**		
18		2004	**	**	**	**		
19		2005	**	**	**	**		
20		2006	**	_ **	**	**		
21		2007	**	_ **	**	**		
22		2008	**	_ **	**	**		
23	[GMO – MPS and L&P General Ledgers (2000 - MPS only)]							

Rebuttal Testimony of V. William Harris

Attached as Highly Confidential Schedule VWH-1 are the actual off-system sales levels for the period 2000 to 2008 for MPS and L&P. As can be seen, despite the different type of offsystem sales transactions that have occurred over the years on the GMO system, off-system sales have occurred and should be included as part of the over all revenue requirement calculation for the MPS and L&P rates.

6 While 2008 sales revenues decreased, Staff notes that since 2000 every annual 7 decrease is followed by an increase the next year. Staff also notes that margin (profit) 8 percentages have increased each of the last two years and have remained in double digits 9 every year since 2000. These historical off-system sales margins can not be characterized as 10 risky, certainly not in the manner for which Staff believes they should be used.

11

12

Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

A. Yes it does.

Q.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of KCP&L) Greater Missouri Operations Company for) Approval to Make Certain Changes in its) Charges for Electric Service.

Case No. ER-2009-0090

AFFIDAVIT OF V. WILLIAM HARRIS

))

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
•	')	SS.
COUNTY OF COLE)	

V. William Harris, of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of H pages to be presented in the above case; that the answers in the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

William Harris

Subscribed and sworn to before me this day of March, 2009.

D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri **Commissioned for Cole County** My Commission Expires: December 08, 2012 Commission Number: 08412071

SCHEDULE VWH-1

HAS BEEN DEEMED

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

IN ITS ENTIRETY

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL SCHEDULE VWH-1