

**FILED**

SEP 28 2016

Missouri Public  
Service Commission

*Exhibit No.:* 105

*Issue:* Fuel Adjustment Clause

*Witness:* Matthew J. Barnes

*Sponsoring Party:* MoPSC Staff

*Type of Exhibit:* Surrebuttal Testimony

*Case No.:* ER-2016-0156

*Date Testimony Prepared:* September 2, 2016

**MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION**

**WATER & SEWER DEPARTMENT**

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**MATTHEW J. BARNES**

**KCP&L GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY**

**CASE NO. ER-2016-0156**

*Jefferson City, Missouri*  
*September 2016*



Rebuttal Testimony of  
Matthew J. Barnes

1           A.    Not entirely. Staff agrees that the only transmission costs that should be  
2 included in the FAC are transmission costs that are necessary to receive purchased power to  
3 serve native load and transmission costs that are necessary to make off-system sales excluding  
4 any and all charges related to Southwest Power Pool ("SPP") charges related to GMO's  
5 Crossroads generating station. The language that is currently in GMO's FAC tariff Sheet  
6 No. 126 was written before the SPP Integrated Market was implemented, which was  
7 March 2014.<sup>2</sup> Since then the Commission has issued several *Report and Orders*<sup>2</sup> addressing  
8 the Day Ahead market and the proper transmission costs to be included in FACs. Staff's  
9 recommendation to change the transmission cost language in GMO's FAC tariff Sheet  
10 No. 126 is consistent with and more accurately reflects the transmission costs the Commission  
11 has allowed other utilities to include in their FACs since the Commission first authorized  
12 GMO's FAC.

13           Q.    Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

14           A.    Yes it does.

---

<sup>2</sup> Kansas City Power & Light Company *Report and Order* in Case No. ER-2014-0370, Ameren Missouri *Report and Order* in File No. ER-2014-0258, and Empire District Electric Company *Report and Order* in Case No. ER-2014-0351.

