

Exhibit No.: 1,132
Issues: Miscellaneous Charges;
Miscellaneous Tariff
Issues

Witness: William L. McDuffey
Sponsoring Party: MO PSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony
Case No.: ER-2004-0034

Date Testimony Prepared: January 26, 2004 as modified February 27, 2004

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

WILLIAM L. MCDUFFEY

FILED³

MAY 10 2004

Missouri Public
Service Commission

AQUILA, INC. D/B/A AQUILA NETWORKS MPS

CASE NO. ER-2004-0034

Jefferson City, Missouri
January 2004

Exhibit No. 1132
Case No(s) ER-2004-0034
Date 3-1-04 Rptr 44

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2		
3	Miscellaneous Charges	2
4	Reconnection Charge.....	2
5	Connection Charge.....	2
6	Collection Charge	3
7	Returned Check Charge.....	3
8	Special Meter Reading Charge	4
9	Temporary Meter Set Charge.....	4
10	Excess Service Line Length.....	5
11	Revenue Requirement Impact.....	5
12	Miscellaneous Tariff Issues	6
13	Moving Structures.....	6
14		
15		
16	Electric Power and Curtailment Plan.....	8
17		
18		
19	Service Extenders.....	9
20	Revenue Requirement Impact.....	9

1 **Miscellaneous Charges**

2 Q. Which miscellaneous charges will you address?

3 A. I will address the following changes, referencing the proposed tariff sheet:

- 4 1. Reconnection Charge – Tariff Sheet No. R-20 and R-66
- 5 2. Connection Charge – Tariff Sheet No. R-20 and R-66
- 6 3. Collection Charge – Tariff Sheet No. R-20 and R-66
- 7 4. Returned Check Charge – Tariff Sheet No. R-21 and R-66
- 8 5. Special Meter Reading Charge – Tariff Sheet No. R-38 and R-66
- 9 6. Temporary Meter Set Charge – Tariff Sheet No. R-51 and R-67
- 10 7. Excess Service Line Length – Tariff Sheet No. R-53 and R-67

11 **Reconnection Charge**

12 Q. Please address the Reconnection Charges proposed by the Company.

13 A. Company proposes to increase reconnection charges to \$30
14 during normal business hours and \$50 outside of normal business hours
15 for the MPS division. MPS's
16 present charges for reconnection are \$17 during normal business hours and \$31 for
17 reconnections made outside normal business hours.

18 These charges are in line with other utilities within the state
19 and reflect the Company's costs to provide these services. The Staff supports the
20 Company's proposal.

21 **Connection Charge**

22 Q. Please describe the Company's Connection Charge proposal.

23

Rebuttal Testimony of
William L. McDuffey

1 A. This is a new charge for the MPS division. A connection
2 charge of \$50 would apply to a customer that requests that initial service be established
3 outside of normal business hours. Initial service connections made during normal
4 business hours would continue to be made at no charge to the customer. This charge
5 reflects the Company's cost of performing this optional service. The Staff supports the
6 Company's proposal.

7 **Collection Charge**

8 Q. Please describe the Company's proposal relating to the Collection Charge.

9 A. This is a new charge for the MPS division. A collection
10 charge would apply when the Company makes a trip to the delinquent customer's meter
11 for the purpose of disconnecting their service, but does not disconnect the service because
12 the customer makes a payment to the Company's service technician. The Company has
13 proposed a collection charge of \$30, which is the same as the reconnection charge during
14 normal business hours, which is the time period in which this occurrence would take
15 place. The Staff supports the Company's proposal.

16 **Returned Check Charge**

17 Q. Please describe the Company's proposal relating to the Returned Check
18 Charge.

19 A. The Company currently charges \$15 for MPS for
20 returned checks. The Company is proposing to increase the charge to \$20. This level
21 reflects the Company's cost of handling returned checks. The Staff supports the
22 Company's proposal.

1 **Special Meter Reading Charge**

2 Q. Please describe the Company's proposal relating to the excess cost of a
3 meter reading by special appointment.

4 A. The Company is proposing a special meter reading charge of \$30 during
5 normal business hours and \$50 outside of normal business hours for this service. The
6 Company's proposal would increase the MPS division's charges from \$12 to \$30 for this
7 service during normal business hours and from \$16 to \$50 for the performance of this
8 service outside of normal business hours.

9 Q. What is the Staff's position relating to these tariff proposals?

10 A. Staff recommends no change from the current tariffs for special meter
11 reading charges because the Company provided no support for these charges in its
12 response to Staff Data Request Number 190.

13 **Temporary Meter Set Charge**

14 Q. Please describe the Company's proposed Temporary Meter Set Charge.

15 A. The Company is proposing a charge of \$100 for MPS
16 division customers. The Company's MPS division currently has a temporary meter set
17 charge of \$100.

18

19

20

21

22

23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Excess Service Line Length

Q. Please describe the Company's proposal for Excess Service Line Length.

A. The Company proposes to charge MPS division customers \$2.52 per foot for the excess length of a service line. This rate is identical to the rate currently in effect for the Company's MPS division.

Q. What is the Staff's position to this tariff proposal?

A. The Staff supports this proposal. This rate reflects the Company's current cost to extend the service line beyond the distance allowed in the tariff and does not vary from installation to installation on a per-foot basis.

Revenue Requirement Impact

Q. Are the effects of implementing these recommendations included within the Staff's revenue requirement recommendation?

A. No. The Staff intends to account for these changes to the miscellaneous charges in the rate implementation phase of this case, i.e., any authorized overall increase in the Company's revenues will be implemented as a combination of changes to the miscellaneous charges and changes to rates.

1 **Miscellaneous Tariff Issues**

2 Q. Which miscellaneous tariff issues will you address?

3 A. I will address the following changes, referencing the proposed tariff sheet:

4 1. Moving Structures – Tariff Sheet No. R-30 (4.09)

5
6
7
8
9 4. Electric Power and Curtailment Plan – Tariff Sheet Nos. R-55 to
10 R-58 (8.)
11
12

13
14 7. Service Extenders – removed

15 **Moving Structures**

16 Q. Please describe the Company's proposal for Moving Structures.

17 A. The allows the Company to charge for all of the

18 associated costs incurred to ensure that no company facilities will make contact with a
19 structure being moved through the Company's service area. The present MPS tariff does
20 not have such a provision; therefore, the Company proposes

21 this provision applicable to the MPS

22 division. The Staff supports the Company's proposal.
23
24
25

Rebuttal Testimony of
William L. McDuffey

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22

1 **Electric Power and Curtailment Plan**

2 Q. Please describe the Company's proposal for Electric Power and
3 Curtailment Plan.

4 A. The Electric Power and Curtailment plan sets forth a sequence for
5 reducing electrical power delivery to its customers in case of emergency.

6 The Company proposes to move
7 the plan from the rates section to the rules section of the tariff.

8 The Staff supports the Company's proposal.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

1

2

3 **Service Extenders**

4 Q. Please describe the Company's proposal for removing the service
5 extenders rule from their tariff.

6 A. Service Extenders are equipment that can be installed to allow a customer,
7 who potentially would be disconnected, an additional six days of reduced capacity
8 service in order to settle the amount due on the customer's account. If the customer did
9 not pay or make payment arrangements, disconnection of service would occur. The
10 Company no longer installs Service Extenders, nor do any of the other regulated electric
11 utilities in Missouri; therefore, the tariff language should be removed. The Staff supports
12 the Company's proposal.

13 **Revenue Requirement Impact**

14 Q. Are the effects of implementing these recommendations included within
15 the Staff's revenue requirement recommendation?

16 A. No. Implementing these changes will have little or no impact on the
17 Company's revenue requirement.

18 Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?

19 A. Yes, it does.