

1 **Q ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU PRESENTING THIS REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON**
2 **REVENUE REQUIREMENT ISSUES?**

3 A This testimony is presented on behalf of Ag Processing, Inc., the Federal Executive
4 Agencies, the Sedalia Industrial Energy Users Association, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., and
5 Whiteman Air Force Base (collectively “Industrials”).

6 **Q WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

7 A I am providing testimony in the area of Off-System Sales (OSS). Because of the lack
8 of information provided by the Company regarding this issue, I am opposing Aquila’s
9 adjustment to OSS.

10 **Q PLEASE DESCRIBE AQUILA’S ADJUSTMENT TO OSS.**

11 A Aquila proposes to reduce the test year level of OSS margins to eliminate what it calls
12 “risk-based trading.” Aquila witness Tim Rush describes the adjustment on page 6 of
13 his direct testimony. Mr. Rush provides no explanation for these types of sales. He
14 only claims that these sales should not be expected to continue for purposes of
15 setting rates. The adjustment Mr. Rush sponsors is an arbitrary estimate of what
16 Aquila believes is the approximate percentage of risk-based trades that were
17 executed during the test year. Aquila estimated that 75% of the OSS during 2007
18 were risk-based.

19 I attended (via telephone) a meeting with Aquila on January 15, 2009 where
20 OSS issues were discussed. During this meeting, Aquila explained that some of the
21 OSS which Aquila had previously made prior to the merger with KCPL would no
22 longer be made due to KCPL’s risk management policy. Aquila explained that prior to
23 the merger it would schedule energy in excess of its scheduled load from the

Greg Meyer
Page 2

1 day-ahead market in the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) and then the next day sell that
2 energy in the SPP real time market. However, Aquila is no longer permitted to
3 engage in those types of transactions. Aquila has been instructed to only schedule
4 the amount of energy in the day-ahead market which it believes it will need to meet
5 native load. If Aquila's explanation is correct, then I would agree that these types of
6 OSS are non-recurring and should be eliminated from Aquila's OSS levels. However,
7 Aquila has failed to provide any analysis quantifying this type of risk-based OSS
8 transaction. To the extent a party wanted to adjust the level of OSS for sales which
9 are no longer executed, an adjustment would be impossible. Aquila needs to provide
10 better information to support its adjustment.

11 Another type of risk-based trades is Q Sales. Q Sales are interchange sales
12 which do not involve any Aquila generators or rely on the transmission system of
13 Aquila. An example of a Q Sale would be where Aquila buys energy from the
14 Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator (MISO) and then subsequently
15 sells that same energy back to MISO. To the extent that these types of sales
16 continue to make a profit for Aquila, those profits should be included in the revenue
17 requirement. The Company has provided no analysis or quantification of this type of
18 transaction.

19 Aquila also fails to state whether other types of risk-based sales will continue
20 to be made as a non-regulated activity. If Aquila intends to continue to make these
21 sales with the assets of Aquila (personnel and infrastructure), but does not want to
22 recognize the revenues in its regulated cost of service, then some costs must be
23 assigned to these sales.

24 Many questions continue to remain for this issue. What is the exact nature of
25 these risk-based sales? What is the quantification of such sales? Will Aquila

1 continue to make these sales and record the revenues as unregulated? What cost
2 assignment does Aquila propose if these sales are deemed unregulated? Because of
3 the inadequate support for this adjustment, the Commission should reject it.

4 **Q DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

5 **A** Yes, it does.

\\Huey\Shares\PLDocs\TSK19051\Testimony - BAI\151287.doc